

## POSTMASTERS.

## ALABAMA.

J. Blocker Thornton, Mobile.

## FLORIDA.

Luther E. McCall, High Springs.  
Robert F. Rogers, Ocala.

## KENTUCKY.

W. G. Dorman, Corinth.  
Ben J. Purdy, Bloomfield.  
Frank C. Sloan, Burnside.  
S. D. Thompson, Owingsville.

## MASSACHUSETTS.

Joseph Metras, Southbridge.  
Richard M. Raymond, Framingham.

## MISSISSIPPI.

Essie F. McCormick, Yazoo City.

## TEXAS.

A. W. Howell, Frost.

## WITHDRAWALS.

*Executive nominations withdrawn January 30, 1914.*

## RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

John V. Killian, of Eminence, Kans., to be receiver of public moneys at Dodge City, in the State of Kansas.

## POSTMASTER.

R. L. Lunsford, jr., to be postmaster at Cleveland, in the State of Oklahoma.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, January 30, 1914.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who hearest and answerest prayer, hear and answer our petition. Grant that all the questions which confront us, national and international, may be wisely, justly, and amicably adjusted, that peace and prosperity may flow on uninterrupted. To this end bless our President and all others in authority and guide them by Thy holy influence. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE FOR SATURDAY, JANUARY 31, 1914.

The SPEAKER. The Chair designates the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. FERRIS, to preside to-morrow as Speaker pro tempore.

## CONTESTED-ELECTION CASE—CARNEY AGAINST SMITH.

Mr. POST. Mr. Speaker, I present herewith a privileged report from the Committee on Elections No. 1 in the contested-election case of Claude S. Carney against John M. C. Smith, in the third congressional district of the State of Michigan, and give notice that I shall call it up for consideration one day next week. (H. Res. 396, H. Rept. 202.)

The SPEAKER. The gentleman presents a privileged report from the Committee on Elections No. 1, in the case of Carney against Smith, giving notice that he will call it up one day next week.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, why not dispose of it now?

The SPEAKER. Is it a unanimous report?

Mr. POST. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Why not dispose of it now?

Mr. POST. I think we better wait until the report is printed.

The SPEAKER. The report will be printed.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. BLACKMON indefinitely, on account of sickness.

## RESTRICTION OF IMMIGRATION.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Speaker, I present herewith a privileged report from the Committee on Rules which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 378 (H. Rept. 205).

*Resolved*, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the House shall resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House bill 6060, with the amendments reported by the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization; that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with, and that there shall be seven hours' general debate, to be divided equally

between those favoring and those opposing the measure. At the expiration of said seven hours' general debate the bill shall be considered under the five-minute rule, and the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union shall perfect and report the measure to the House, whereupon the previous question shall be considered as ordered upon the bill and all pending amendments, including those adopted in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, to final passage without intervening motions, except one motion to recommit.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDWICK. Certainly.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, it was understood last night that this matter would be withheld until after the consideration of the Private Calendar, which has the right of way to-day.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Speaker, I will answer the gentleman by saying that this is the regular day for the Committee on Claims, but as long as that committee had only six bills, and by their next meeting day expected to have quite a number to engage the attention of the House, that committee did not press its claim for recognition to-day.

Mr. MADDEN. Very well.

Mr. HARDWICK. And in connection with that, Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as the gentleman has referred to what happened last night, I wish to say that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT], in presenting the report from the Committee on Rules yesterday afternoon, inadvertently presented a resolution which the committee had not agreed to report; and in the exercise of great caution, so that the record of the House may not show what neither the gentleman from Tennessee nor I desire it to show, I ask unanimous consent that the report presented by the gentleman from Tennessee be vacated.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that the report presented yesterday afternoon by the gentleman from Tennessee be voided. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] is aware of the fact that we have had this resolution before the committee, first and last, in three different forms. The matter came up hurriedly yesterday afternoon and the print, which was sent to the Clerk's desk by myself to be read, was in fact not the print which the committee had agreed upon, although that fact was overlooked. There was a slight amendment to it which should have been inserted. I do not know that there is any necessity for voiding it. I think the proper proceeding would be that I should ask unanimous consent to withdraw the resolution which I presented yesterday afternoon, and I therefore do ask unanimous consent to withdraw that resolution.

Mr. HARDWICK. That is the same thing.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to withdraw the resolution which he offered yesterday afternoon. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MANN. The Clerk reported the resolution which has just been read as House resolution 378. Is that correct?

Mr. HARDWICK. Yes; this is House resolution 378, which the Committee on Rules has reported with an amendment, the amendment simply providing that the first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with.

Mr. MANN. I have in my hand a resolution offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT].

Mr. HARDWICK. This is House resolution 378. Now, Mr. Speaker, is there any necessity for any debate on this rule?

Mr. MANN. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. HARDWICK. Certainly; I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. Under the terms of this resolution is it expected to set aside next Monday, unanimous-consent day, if the matter should go over that far?

Mr. HARDWICK. I will answer the gentleman frankly on that matter. I believe that when the House acts under special order the general rules of the House fixing special days, and so forth, are set aside, except in the one case of Calendar Wednesday. Of course that point, as far as I know, has not been ruled upon by the present occupant of the chair, and it would be a matter of construction by the Speaker of the House.

Mr. MANN. I think the form of the resolution which the gentleman from Alabama introduced, House resolution 386, which is different, provided for consideration from day to day.

Mr. HARDWICK. Yes.

Mr. MANN. That undoubtedly—

Mr. HARDWICK. Undoubtedly, without any question being raised, by any possibility.

Mr. MANN. I take it that unless the previous question was ordered it would let it go over without the previous question being ordered.

Mr. HARDWICK. Undoubtedly.

Mr. MANN. May I ask the gentleman further? I notice the resolution provides that when the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union reports back to the House the previous question shall be considered as ordered upon the bill and all pending amendments, including those adopted in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union. That, I suppose, is taken from some old form which somebody introduced heretofore—

Mr. HARDWICK. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Of course there is no other amendment, I take it, in the House except those reported from the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HARDWICK. Yes.

Mr. MANN. If that language is left in the resolution, it might imply the previous question was ordered on any other amendments which were offered. Would it not be better to strike it out and have it clearly that the previous question is ordered on all pending amendments which are reported back from the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union?

Mr. HARDWICK. I realize the justice of the gentleman's criticism, although I do not think it is important. I believe the construction would be that the House would vote only on the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and therefore pending in the House. The gentleman is correct, in that we have followed an old form in preparing this rule. If the gentleman desires to present a request for unanimous consent to strike out that language in the resolution, to wit, "including those adopted in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union," personally I should not object. I think to do so would really improve the phraseology of the resolution.

Mr. MANN. Well, I make that request, Mr. Speaker—to strike out of the resolution the language "including those adopted in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union."

Mr. HARDWICK. I have no objection; I think it is really an improvement.

Mr. MANN. That leaves it without doubt. Those amendments are the only ones to be voted upon.

Mr. HARDWICK. I agree with the gentleman on that. I think it has the effect, anyhow, but I believe it is an improvement.

Mr. MANN. I think likely it would have that effect, but it gives an opportunity for controversy, which might lead to debate.

Mr. HARDWICK. If the gentleman will submit the request, I will have no objection to it.

The SPEAKER. Has the gentleman from Illinois a request to submit?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to strike out of the resolution these words, in the latter part of the resolution, "including those adopted in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union," so there will be no question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to adopt an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by striking out the words "including those adopted in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. The agreement to the proposition submitted by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] will not preclude, will it, a vote in the House on any separate amendment?

Mr. MANN. Not on any amendments that are not agreed to in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. You have a perfect right to have a separate vote on any amendment.

Mr. HARDWICK. I see no objection to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Speaker, unless the gentleman can get this through by unanimous consent, I do not want to lose the floor for this purpose.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not lose the floor. He is in control of this resolution.

Mr. HARDWICK. All right. Then I will yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Pennsylvania rise?

Mr. MOORE. To reserve the right to object in order to ask a question, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will proceed.

Mr. MOORE. We could not hear all of the conversation that took place between the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK]. Some of us on this side of the House are interested in this bill. As I understand the request now, it is proposed to protect the right of amendment when the bill is read under the five-minute rule?

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will pardon me, the rule provides that when the bill is reported back from the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union the previous question shall be considered as ordered upon the bill and all amendments to final passage. The proposition is to leave it in that shape.

Mr. MOORE. That means after the bill has been read and opportunity to amend under the five-minute rule has been afforded to every Member of the House?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. Very well.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MOORE. Will acquiescence in this request for unanimous consent deprive us from discussing the rule any further? The rule has been changed since last night.

The SPEAKER. Oh, the Chair thinks not.

Mr. MOORE. Very well.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] is recognized.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Speaker, how much time do the gentlemen on the other side wish for the discussion of this rule?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK], I will say that the report on this rule is a harmonious one from the Committee on Rules, and I have no requests on this side of the House for a discussion or a criticism of the rule; and the gentleman from Pennsylvania informs me that he has had no requests.

Mr. HARDWICK. We have had no requests on this side.

Mr. CAMPBELL. And I am not disposed to take any time in the discussion of the rule at this time.

Mr. GARDNER. I would like two minutes.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The gentleman from Massachusetts will take a little time.

Mr. HARDWICK. Let me say this to the gentleman: Suppose I demand the previous question on the passage of the resolution?

Mr. CAMPBELL. That will leave all the time demanded on this side.

Mr. HARDWICK. I then demand the previous question.

Mr. MANN. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. The understanding of the Chair is that debate has not yet been commenced?

The SPEAKER. Yes. This is parliamentary talk, and the Chair does not think it is general debate. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] moves the previous question.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Speaker, I understand the gentleman from Georgia to yield to me now?

Mr. HARDWICK. I withhold just a moment for a statement.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. In reporting the resolution that has been withdrawn by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] he undertook to say that he thought there was no opposition to the rule?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. With pleasure.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I did make that statement, and in justice to the gentleman from New York I wish to say—

Mr. GARDNER. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GARDNER. If this is debate, it will destroy the 40 minutes?

The SPEAKER. Of course it will.

Mr. HARDWICK. I withhold the motion temporarily, retaining the floor so that the gentleman may make a statement.

Mr. GARDNER. You can get it in the 40 minutes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to make a statement without destroying the parliamentary situation.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] asks unanimous consent to make a statement without destroying the parliamentary situation. Is there objection? [After a pause:] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. In presenting the resolution yesterday afternoon I did state that I did not think there was any opposition in the Committee on Rules to the adoption of this resolution.

It was inexcusable in me, Mr. Speaker, to make that statement. That is to say, my memory was at fault. I ought to have known, as I did know if I had thought, that if there ever was a persistent, well-drawn-out, vigorous opposition to anything on earth it was the opposition of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOLDFOGLE] to the adoption of this rule. [Applause.] I regret exceedingly that my memory lapsed for a moment and that I thus placed the gentleman from New York in an erroneous attitude in regard to that. [Applause.]

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Speaker, I now demand the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] demands the previous question on the resolution.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes have it.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Speaker, I call for a division.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. GOLDFOGLE] demands a division. Those in favor of the previous question will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] One hundred and one gentlemen have arisen in the affirmative. Those opposed will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] Thirty-one gentlemen have arisen in the negative.

Mr. LEVY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. On this vote the ayes are 101 and the noes are 31.

Mr. HARDWICK. I hope the gentleman from New York [Mr. LEVY] will not do that.

Mr. LEVY. Yes; I make the point of order, Mr. Speaker, that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LEVY] makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Evidently there is not. The Doorkeeper will lock the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll. Those in favor of the previous question will answer "yea" when their names are called; those opposed will answer "nay."

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 238, nays 102, answered "present" 7, not voting 86, as follows:

YEAS—238.

Adair	Davis	Hardwick	McGuire, Okla.
Adamson	Decker	Hardy	McKellar
Alexander	Dent	Harrison	McKenzie
Allen	Dershem	Hart	McLaughlin
Anderson	Dickinson	Haugen	MacDonald
Anthony	Dies	Hawley	Maguire, Nebr.
Ashbrook	Dixon	Hay	Manahan
Aswell	Doolittle	Hayden	Mann
Austln	Doughton	Hayes	Mapes
Bailey	Edwards	Heflin	Mondell
Baltz	Elder	Helm	Montague
Barkley	Esch	Helvering	Moon
Bartlett	Evans	Henry	Morgan, Okla.
Barton	Falson	Hensley	Morrison
Bathrick	Falconer	Hinds	Moss, Ind.
Beakes	Farr	Holland	Moss, W. Va.
Bell, Cal.	Ferguson	Houston	Murray, Okla.
Bell, Ga.	Ferris	Howard	Neely, W. Va.
Borchers	Fess	Hughes, Ga.	Nelson
Bowdie	Fields	Hughes, W. Va.	O'Hair
Brockson	Finley	Hullings	Oldfield
Browne, Wis.	Flood, Va.	Humphrey, Wash.	Padgett
Browning	Floyd, Ark.	Humphreys, Miss.	Page, N. C.
Buchanan, Ill.	Foster	Jacoway	Palmer
Buchanan, Tex.	Fowler	Johnson, Ky.	Park
Burnett	Francis	Johnson, Utah	Parker
Butler	Frear	Johnson, Wash.	Patton, Pa.
Byrnes, S. C.	French	Keating	Payne
Byrnes, Tenn.	Gard	Keister	Platt
Campbell	Gardner	Kelly, Pa.	Plumley
Candler, Miss.	Garner	Kennedy, Iowa	Post
Cantrill	Garrett, Tenn.	Kent	Prouty
Caraway	Garrett, Tex.	Kettner	Powers
Carlin	Gillett	Kless, Pa.	Prouty
Carr	Glass	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Quin
Church	Godwin, N. C.	Kirkpatrick	Ralney
Clark, Fla.	Goeke	La Follette	Raker
Clayton	Good	Langham	Rayburn
Clayton	Gray	Langley	Reilly, Wis.
Collier	Green, Iowa	Lee, Ga.	Rothermel
Connelly, Kans.	Greene, Vt.	Lenroot	Rouse
Cooper	Gregg	Leshner	Rubey
Covington	Griest	Lever	Rupley
Cox	Gudger	Lewis, Md.	Russell
Crisp	Guernsey	Lindbergh	Saunders
Cullop	Hamilton, Mich.	Lindquist	Scott
Danforth	Hamilton, N. Y.	Linthicum	Seldomridge
Davenport	Hamlin	Lloyd	Shackelford

Sharp	Smith, Tex.	Taylor, Colo.	Watson
Sims	Sparkman	Temple	Weaver
Sinnott	Stedman	Ten Eyck	Whaley
Sisson	Stephens, Cal.	Thomas	White
Slayden	Stephens, Miss.	Thompson, Okla.	Williams
Slemp	Stephens, Nebr.	Treadway	Wilson, Fla.
Sloan	Stephens, Tex.	Tribble	Witherspoon
Small	Stevens, N. H.	Underhill	Woodruff
Smith, Idaho	Switzer	Underwood	Young, N. Dak.
Smith, J. M. C.	Taggart	Vaughan	Young, Tex.
Smith, Md.	Taylor, Ala.	Walters	
Smith, Saml. W.	Taylor, Ark.	Watkins	

NAYS—102.

Ansberry	Dunn	Lafferty	Reed
Bartholdt	Dupré	Lazaro	Riordan
Booher	Dyer	Lee, Pa.	Roberts, Mass.
Britten	Eagan	Levy	Rogers
Brown, N. Y.	Edmonds	Lieb	Sabath
Brumbaugh	Estopinal	Loneragan	Scully
Bryan	Fordney	McAndrews	Sherley
Bulkley	George	McCoy	Sherwood
Burgess	Gerry	McDermott	Shreve
Burke, Wis.	Gillmore	McGillcuddy	Smith, Minn.
Cantor	Gittins	Madden	Smith, N. Y.
Chandler, N. Y.	Goldfogle	Mahan	Stafford
Clancy	Gordon	Mitchell	Steenerson
Cline	Gorman	Moore	Stevens, Minn.
Coady	Goulden	Morgan, La.	Stone
Connolly, Iowa	Graham, Ill.	Murray, Mass.	Sutherland
Copley	Greene, Mass.	Nolan, J. I.	Talcott, N. Y.
Cramton	Hamill	Norton	Tavener
Crosser	Hammond	O'Brien	Taylor, N. Y.
Curry	Howell	Oglesby	Thacher
Dale	Igoe	O'Leary	Thomson, Ill.
Deitrick	Kahn	Paige, Mass.	Townsend
Dillon	Kennedy, R. I.	Patten, N. Y.	Tuttle
Donohoe	Kinhead, N. J.	Peters, Mass.	Walsh
Donovan	Knowland, J. R.	Peters, Me.	
Driscoll	Konop	Phelan	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—7.

Barnhart	Logue	Talbott, Md.	Wallin
Borland	Porter	Towner	

NOT VOTING—86.

Abercrombie	Curley	Key, Ohio	Ranch
Aiken	Difenderfer	Kindel	Reilly, Conn.
Ainey	Dooling	Kitchin	Richardson
Avis	Doremus	Korby	Roberts, Nev.
Baker	Eagle	Kreider	Rucker
Barchfeld	Fairchild	L'Engle	Sells
Beall, Tex.	Fitzgerald	Lewis, Pa.	Stanley
Blackmon	FitzHenry	Lobeck	Stout
Bremner	Gallagher	Loft	Stringer
Brodbeck	Goodwin, Ark.	McClellan	Sumners
Broussard	Graham, Pa.	Maher	Vare
Brown, W. Va.	Griffin	Martin	Volstead
Bruckner	Helgesen	Merritt	Walker
Burke, Pa.	Hill	Metz	Webb
Burke, S. Dak.	Hinebaugh	Miller	Whitacre
Calder	Hobson	Morin	Wills
Callaway	Hoxworth	Mott	Wilson, N. Y.
Carew	Hull	Murdock	Wingo
Carter	Johnson, S. C.	Neeley, Kans.	Wingslow
Cary	Jones	O'Shanessy	Woods
Casey	Kelley, Mich.	Peterson	
Conry	Kennedy, Conn.	Ragsdale	

So the previous question was ordered. The Clerk announced the following pairs: For the session: Mr. HOBSON with Mr. FAIRCHILD. Until further notice: Mr. HILL with Mr. CARY. Mr. RAUCH with Mr. SELLS. Mr. LOBECK with Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. RUCKER with Mr. MILLER. Mr. KEY of Ohio with Mr. HINEBAUGH. Mr. HULL with Mr. MARTIN. Mr. DOREMUS with Mr. WOODS. Mr. DIFENDERFER with Mr. LEWIS of Pennsylvania. Mr. CONRY with Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. CARTER with Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. Mr. AIKEN with Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania. Mr. RUCKER with Mr. KREIDER. Mr. WEBB with Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. FITZHENRY with Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada. Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland with Mr. MERRITT. Mr. WILSON of New York with Mr. HELGESEN. On this vote: Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina (for) with Mr. MAHER (against). Mr. MOTT (for) with Mr. FITZGERALD (against). Mr. ABERCROMBIE (for) with Mr. CALDER (against). Mr. AVIS (for) with Mr. KENNEDY of Connecticut (against). Mr. KEILEY of Michigan (for) with Mr. MILLER (against). Mr. WALKER (for) with Mr. VARE (against). Mr. PORTER (for) with Mr. MORIN (against). Mr. AINEY (for) with Mr. CURLEY (against). Mr. WINGO (for) with Mr. BARCHFELD (against). Mr. L'ENGLE (for) with Mr. BRUCKNER (against). Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas (for) with Mr. TOWNER (against).

Mr. KITCHIN (for) with Mr. REILLY of Connecticut (against).  
Mr. BLACKMON (for) with Mr. WINSLOW (against).  
Mr. WILLIS (for) with Mr. METZ (against).  
Mr. CALLEWAY (for) with Mr. DOOLING (against).

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. A quorum is present. The previous question is ordered. The Doorkeeper will unlock the doors. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] is recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] for 20 minutes.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, do I understand that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] is opposed to this rule?

The SPEAKER. He stated that he was not.

Mr. SABATH. I am opposed to the rule. Am I not entitled to the 20 minutes on the other side?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I do not understand that simply because a man is opposed to the rule, whether he is a member of the Committee on Rules or not, that would entitle him to control the time against the rule.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I rise for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] whether he will yield to me a part of his time, or else that part of the time in opposition to the gentleman from Georgia be accorded to me as a matter of right. I am one of the Committee on Rules, and I think that being opposed to the rule I am entitled to control a part of the time.

Mr. HARDWICK. I think we can settle that. I am perfectly willing to yield half my time to the gentlemen on this side who oppose the adoption of the resolution, and I understood that the gentleman from Kansas, having control of the time on that side, would adopt an equally liberal policy. In fact, the gentleman from Kansas had agreed to yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]. So I think the time will be fairly divided. Of course, if gentlemen want to insist on their rights as members of the committee, then the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOLDFOGLE], who is opposed to the rule, is entitled to control the time in opposition.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that the proper conduct of a matter like this is that if anybody on the Committee on Rules is opposed to the resolution, and there is only one on the Committee on Rules who is opposed to it, he ought to be recognized to control the time in opposition.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I would not have the Chair make a ruling here that would establish any other precedent. I think that is the correct procedure in the House. If the gentleman from New York insists upon controlling half of the time, I shall not claim to control the usual time allowed to the other side.

The SPEAKER. The Chair was of the impression from the statement of the gentleman from Kansas that it was a unanimous report, and his mind was attracted to something else at the time when the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] made his statement.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I did make the statement that it was the unanimous report from the Committee on Rules, but I made it inadvertently, for I knew that the gentleman from New York was opposed to any rule.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will settle the matter by recognizing the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] to control 20 minutes and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOLDFOGLE], a member of the Committee on Rules and opposed to the rule, to control 20 minutes.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, what will become of the requests on this side for time that have been made of the gentleman from Kansas?

The SPEAKER. They will have to make their requests of the men that control the time; the Chair can not control it. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] is recognized for 20 minutes in favor of the rule and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOLDFOGLE] for 20 minutes in opposition to the rule, and the time is running. [Laughter.]

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Speaker, I want to say in support of this rule that no one can complain that it is unfair. The rule simply provides that there shall be seven hours for general debate on this bill and then that the bill shall be considered in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union under the five-minute rule, without limitation either as to the length of debate or the number of amendments that may be offered and considered. I make the statement here and now, without fear of successful contradiction, that no immigration bill and few bills of any character have ever been presented to this House of Representatives under more liberal terms. The rights of the minority under this proposition are safely protected by

an opportunity for full and liberal discussion and for amendment.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, if this rule be adopted by the House of Representatives, the majority on this floor will work its will about this bill and every amendment that is suggested to it, without artificial restraint. We ask you what can be fairer? We ask you what can be more just to men on all sides, of all views, of both sides of this Chamber than this rule? Certainly the minority in any legislative body can have no cause of complaint if they are given as liberal opportunity for discussion and for amendment as they are given full and free opportunity to debate and suggest amendments here. That is provided in this rule.

As to the bill itself, I shall say little. It presents an issue that we are all familiar with. It presents an issue that we have voted on many times in this body. It is substantially and practically, with very little change, the Burnett bill that we passed during the last days of the last session of the preceding Congress. Our record is made up on it. The older Members in this House have voted on this measure, our views are known of all men, and so it seems to me that there is little reason for discussion at the present moment of the merits of the bill. We are going to have the most liberal discussion of the bill itself after the rule is adopted.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDWICK. Certainly.

Mr. MOORE. This rule proposes to allow seven hours of general debate?

Mr. HARDWICK. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. Can the gentleman indicate how long the debate is to run; that is, how many days?

Mr. HARDWICK. That would depend upon how long the House will sit in session.

Mr. MOORE. If we should sit until 8 o'clock to-night, that would be seven hours, and then it would probably take all day to-morrow to consider the bill under the five-minute rule.

Mr. HARDWICK. After we finish the general debate we still have consideration under the five-minute rule. It is a bill that is quite lengthy, containing 57 pages. Although it is largely a codification of existing law, still it is to be considered in the form in which it is presented. My own judgment is—and, of course, it is a mere guess—that we can not get through the consideration in Committee of the Whole in less than two days.

Mr. MOORE. Can we have an understanding that there will be no vote on it to-morrow?

Mr. HARDWICK. It would be impossible for me to make any such agreement. The chairman of the committee, Mr. BURNETT, is in charge of the bill, and he will perhaps be able to answer the gentleman.

Mr. MOORE. Let me ask the gentleman, Is it proposed under this rule to give consideration to the bill on Monday next?

Mr. HARDWICK. My own judgment is that it would be entitled to be considered on Monday.

Mr. MOORE. Even if it does cut out the Unanimous Consent Calendar?

Mr. HARDWICK. If we were operating under general rules it would be different, but when the House is operating under a special rule, even though it does not provide for a continuing consideration, it is my judgment that the general rules are dispensed with until the special order is exhausted.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDWICK. Certainly.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman know whether that coincides with the judgment and opinion of other gentlemen, especially the Speaker of the House?

Mr. HARDWICK. The gentleman from Massachusetts will have to ask the Speaker as to that point.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. It happens that the gentleman from Massachusetts has done so. If the immigration bill is not concluded by Wednesday, will it have precedence on Calendar Wednesday?

Mr. HARDWICK. It can not, under an express provision in the rules. That is the only exception, I think, which can be made to the statement that I have just made.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I used?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has used five minutes.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia did not quite answer my question. I was trying to get an understanding with him.

Mr. HARDWICK. But I can not give you the understanding that you are asking. The gentleman is interrogating the wrong man. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] in charge

of this bill will have to make whatever agreement is made upon that subject, and as he is going to speak later on the subject of the rule, I will ask the gentleman to press his inquiry of that gentleman at that time.

Mr. MOORE. Very well.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman reserves 15 minutes.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I admit that the rule brought in by the Rules Committee is a fair rule, and if the bill were as fair as the rule I would not object to it. However, I do object to the Rules Committee bringing in a special rule on this bill when, in fact, there is no general demand for this legislation. The Democratic Party as well as the Republican Party has gone on record on the subject of immigration legislation, and the last Democratic platform, which contained specific reference to this question, contained the following:

We condemn and denounce any and all attempts to restrict immigration of the industrious and worthy of foreign lands.

Through the veto message of President Taft during the last administration the Republican Party expressed its views on this subject and went on record as opposing such unfair legislation.

I do not believe that we should consider this bill now, when there is pending other important legislation which should be speedily enacted into law. It was only a few days ago that the President of the United States called our attention to several measures which he deemed of great importance and which he urged should be passed at an early date, yet the Committee on Rules has not seen fit to bring in a special rule for the purpose of considering any of the measures recommended by the President.

There may be some gentleman rise later on and state that there is a demand for this legislation. If such a demand exists, and this I do not admit, it comes from professional restrictionists who have been clamoring for years for the enactment of such a measure; but the country at large and the great mass of the people are not seeking this legislation; they are perfectly contented with the existing conditions. The restrictionists may say that this legislation is necessary on account of the volume of immigration now coming to our shores; but, Mr. Speaker, I desire to say that this great volume of immigration that we have been receiving has been a blessing to this country.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL].

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] who has just taken his seat had not addressed the House in the vein in which he did, I doubt if I should have taken the time to say anything on this rule. He read from the Democratic platform a provision which pledges to the country that the Democratic Party will not restrict the immigration of those who are worthy and industrious and come to our shores to find employment. I call his attention and the attention of the House to the fact that at the time that platform was written the country was enjoying the fruits of Republican policies, and that the labor of our land was all employed at the highest wage that labor had ever received. To-day we find ourselves in an entirely different situation.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Not now.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. CAMPBELL. We to-day have a Democratic administration and are living under Democratic policies, and millions of our laborers are without work. Therefore the proposition to restrict immigration is a very proper subject of consideration for this House at this time. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] says there is no demand for such legislation. He evidently overlooked the fact that the miners' convention, which is now in session in Indianapolis, declared a few days ago that not only this bill, but a bill absolutely prohibiting all immigration should be enacted into law; and I am not sure that that is not the thing that should be done. We should at least prohibit all immigration that comes to our country to find work until we get rid of this Democratic administration, with its policies, so that we can give employment to all our own laborers at good wages. After that we might well admit such others as are needed in the industries of our country to keep up the number of men necessary to supply the demand for labor. This was the condition during the last Congress, when this bill was under consideration before. Every industry in the country was demanding more laborers. To-day practically every industry in the country is laying off laborers.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL. For a very brief question.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. I put the question only because the gentleman from Kansas is a careful gentleman, and usually has authority for any statement that he may make. I would like to inquire what authority, if any, he has for the statement he made about the million men that are unemployed in this country?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Oh, I call the attention of the gentleman from Massachusetts to the reports that occur daily in the newspapers from Chicago, from Indianapolis, from Cleveland, from St. Louis, from New York, from the Pacific coast, from all over the country that hundreds of thousands of men are out of employment, amounting in all to millions.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. But the gentleman has no information from any official source like the Department of Labor, from the head of the Department of Labor?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Oh, no; the Department of Labor up to the present has not published the number of men who are out of employment. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] The head of the Department of Labor is not giving out official reports on the unemployed.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE.]

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I avail myself of these three minutes in an endeavor to come to an arrangement with the chairman of the committee as to the manner in which this debate shall be conducted. I have no special fault to find with the rule, although, being a gag rule in a mild form, I shall vote against it on general principles. It limits debate on a great public question. Seven hours have been allotted by the generosity of the gentlemen of the Committee on Rules, and I assume at the suggestion of the chairman of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, and I would like to ask—

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. May I interrupt the gentleman for a second?

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Oh, no; the gentleman from Alabama insisted on only four hours. It is the gentleman from New York who insisted upon the much longer time of seven hours.

Mr. HARDWICK. The gentleman finally got the seven hours.

Mr. MOORE. I am very glad to be corrected; and I notice that the gentleman from Alabama is silent and does not answer the charge. They sought to get through in four hours rather than seven. Now, the question I desire to propound is this: If this debate runs seven hours to-day, we will run until 8 o'clock to-night. If we undertake to pass this bill to-morrow, we will probably have a night session, and we will have to have a quorum in order to pass the bill. Now, can we have an understanding with the gentleman, without further complaint about the rule, that we shall have no vote on this bill until Monday?

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the question of the gentleman, I would not want to make an agreement of that kind. I hope we will be able to get through with this bill to-morrow. It is evident there is at least one gentleman here who expects to try to obstruct all progress—I mean by filibustering—and I hope—

Mr. MOORE. Name that gentleman.

Mr. BURNETT. The gentleman who made the motion a while ago—

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has the floor; does he yield?

Mr. MOORE. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama—

Mr. SABATH. May I suggest—

Mr. MOORE (continuing). To further answer my question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman yields to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. MOORE. If the gentleman from Illinois will pardon me for a moment, I think it is important we have an understanding, if we can reach one, because there are some of our colleagues here who want to use to-morrow afternoon and may be compelled to stay here to-night until midnight and be compelled to stay to-morrow night until midnight, and that will be unfortunate and very unprofitable. If we can reach an arrangement, if the gentleman will agree that the vote pass over until next week—

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman permit? How will it suit the gentleman to agree upon an hour when this bill will be voted upon, instead of asking for an agreement for a time when it will not be voted upon?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORE. And the question is unanswered.

Mr. BURNETT. I will not agree to the gentleman's proposition; I will agree to the other to have a vote taken at a time which may be agreed upon.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORE. I ask for two minutes more.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I would like to grant the request, but I can not in view of other arrangements.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU].

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the statement of my colleague from Kansas that there are millions of men out of employment in the country and that a state of panic exists, I want to quote from two Republican papers.

The extracts I shall read relate to a statement made last December by the Republican leader [Mr. MANN], but as the gentleman from Kansas makes a similar charge, these extracts from Republican papers may be considered as replying to both:

[From the New York Press, Dec. 17.]

If Representative MANN really said, as he has been quoted, that business men are "nearly scared to death" and that the country is now in the midst of an industrial and financial panic, he went a great deal further than any facts warrant—a great deal further than anybody, even in the game of playing politics, ought to go. \* \* \* Industry and commerce knew the tariff change was coming long before it arrived, and they generally prepared for it.

[From the New York Evening Mail, Dec. 20.]

Though Representative MANN in his desperate search for an elixir to rescue the Republican Party from its state of noxious desuetude cries "panic," America receives the outburst without ceasing for a moment its tremendous industrial activity. \* \* \* America is still a growing concern.

[Applause.]

Mr. MANN. You will find men out of employment just the same.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MANAHAN].

Mr. MANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, my objection to this rule is centered in the allowance of seven hours for general debate. I was amazed at the statement made by the chairman of the Committee on Rules that this was a liberal allowance for a discussion of this bill.

Mr. HARDWICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANAHAN. I can not yield. My time is too limited.

Mr. HARDWICK. I just wanted to state to him it was a matter of agreement.

Mr. MANAHAN. It was a matter of agreement, which I am advised by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOLDFOGLE] was a sort of compromise agreement, because the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT], in charge of the bill, wanted to limit the debate to four hours. And I say that that disposition on the part of the gentleman from Alabama shows conclusively that as chairman of the committee in charge of this bill he dare not permit a generous time for this discussion. [Applause.]

But when the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] or the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] says that seven hours is a liberal allowance, it shows that he has not the faintest conception of the mighty issues involved in this bill. And when he says that the Members of this House are familiar with this question he insults the intelligence of every Member here. There are not 10 men in this House who have studied economic conditions as they should study them in order to pass upon this bill. The insanity statistics, the illiteracy statistics, in the United States and in the different States, the character of the races affected by this restriction, the effect on labor and cost of living conditions which this bill will impose upon the people have not been studied by gentlemen in this House, and they are ignorant upon these questions. [Applause.] This bill violates every principle of justice and reverses the highest principle of asylum which has ennobled this Nation during its whole history. It is absurd to limit the debate in opposition to it to three and one-half hours. A full debate would defeat the literacy test in this measure, as it should be defeated.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT].

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, I think when we conclude the general debate the number of Members present who will listen to it will convince anyone that the seven hours are amply sufficient.

Mr. MANAHAN. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. LENROOT. I have but a limited time.

Mr. MANAHAN. My question is this: Does not the fact that they will not be here and listen to the debate on this question conclusively show that they do not appreciate the importance of it?

Mr. LENROOT. I can not yield further than that.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Does the gentleman favor the initiative and referendum?

Mr. LENROOT. I rise particularly to speak to the question raised by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK], as to the interpretation of this rule. It was my understanding that there was to be an amendment to this rule eliminating Wednesdays and Mondays in the consideration of this bill. The misunderstanding probably was my own. It is not in the rule, and I want to suggest, and I shall not argue it now, Mr. Speaker, that before finally coming to a conclusion as to the proper interpretation of this rule I think the Speaker will be convinced that if consideration of the bill upon Mondays is permissible the same will be true of Wednesdays.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENROOT. I can not yield within the three minutes.

Mr. MANN. It is conceded that this rule will not bring this bill up on either Mondays or Wednesdays?

Mr. LENROOT. If it is—

Mr. HARDWICK. I do not think the gentleman would let it go that way. It was argued otherwise.

Mr. MANN. You said Mondays.

Mr. HARDWICK. I said Wednesdays.

Mr. LENROOT. One other thing in reference to this rule itself. I am in favor of it. But on the 21st day of January I received a letter from the chairman of the Immigration Committee, reading as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION,  
Washington, D. C., January 21, 1914.

MY DEAR SIR: As soon as the Post Office appropriation bill is out of the way a rule will be reported making House bill 8060, the immigration bill, in order. Seven hours will be allowed for general debate, and it will then be taken up for consideration under the five-minute rule. I urgently request you as a friend of the bill to be present during its consideration.

Yours, very truly,

JOHN L. BURNETT.

Mr. Speaker, when I received the letter from the distinguished gentleman, the Committee on Rules had not met for weeks, and I am a member of that committee. And we have come to this point, apparently, namely, that partisanship is carried to such an extent that the Democratic members of the Committee on Rules meet in committee caucus and determine every question before that committee. I have been a member of that committee, Mr. Speaker, for three years, and three weeks ago was the first occasion when there had been any partisanship of this nature exhibited on that committee, and it ought not to be exhibited on a bill of this kind. It is immaterial whether the Republican members would favor this rule in committee or whether they would have changed it if they could, the fact is you ought not to determine questions of this character in this way. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Speaker, I now yield two minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MURRAY].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MURRAY] is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, those gentlemen who favor this rule seem to have taken the position that was suggested by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL], that there is in the country to-day such a condition of unemployment that a great emergency demands the exclusion of all immigrants.

I have not had the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to travel through the larger parts of the country through which the gentleman from Kansas has probably traveled in his wanderings, but I have seen conditions in my own State of Massachusetts, and I have some clear conception of the real conditions existing up there.

During October last, particularly, I was called upon to go through the State—a great manufacturing State—and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER], my colleague, will tell you that he saw, just as the rest of us saw, factories that had smoke coming from their stacks in the daytime and factories which had operatives, men and women, working in the nighttime. The times were so good that—

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. The gentleman from Kansas started a calamity howl as the basis for his speech.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. Yes; surely.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts know that poverty has increased over 300 per cent in the month of December in the town of Worcester?

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. No, sir. I will ask the gentleman from Kansas if he did not see that in some newspaper?

Mr. CAMPBELL. It was reported in a Worcester newspaper. Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. It is probably a Republican paper.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I do not know whether it is a Republican paper or not, but it is reported in a paper published in Worcester, Mass. I have it here.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. Well, there are Republican papers published in Worcester. The gentleman should not imagine that they have only Democratic newspapers in Worcester.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that if my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] will tell the facts as he found them, he will say that there was a condition, certainly in last October and November, that made it impossible for him and his friends who supported him for governor to claim that there was any general unemployment in our State.

We are a great manufacturing Commonwealth, with boot and shoe factories situated in many parts of the State and with textile industries for the manufacture of cotton and woolen goods situated in many other parts of the State; and certainly after the tariff bill was put through a situation was presented that would have accentuated the conditions of unemployment if the terrible conditions that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] suggests were in existence in the land.

I deny that any emergency calling for the passage of this legislation now exists. The Committee on Rules ought not to report a rule of this kind without certain evidence of pressing need for this legislation.

There is no presentation of this evidence to this House, and I shall not give my vote in support of a rule the only purpose of which is to hasten the passage of an unwise measure which excludes good men and women who can not read or write. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. If nobody wants to speak [laughter]—

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Speaker, I would like the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] to use some of his time.

Mr. HARDWICK. I have only a speech in conclusion.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Then, Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to my colleague from New York, Mr. CANTOR.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CANTOR] is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I do not suppose that anything that I can say will affect the judgment of the House, so far as the adoption of this rule is concerned, as has been plainly shown by the vote thus taken. But this is the first time since I have been a Member of this body that I have had the opportunity of voting upon a special rule reported by the Committee on Rules.

I am opposed to special rules at this stage of the session. It has been my limited experience in other legislative bodies that at the close of a session, or toward the close, when public business is unnecessarily delayed, it is proper then to introduce rules of this kind, so that legislation for the general benefit of all of the people can be passed. But in this session we have been here less than six weeks. This bill, under the ordinary procedure provided for by the rules, could be reached within a reasonable time, and I can conceive of no possible reason for this haste except the desire of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT], the chairman of the committee, to claim the credit of passing this bill and having it bear his name, and he can have that credit, which will come up hereafter to plague him.

This bill should not be taken out of its order and jumped over the heads of other bills, which I consider to be fully as important as this.

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to discuss the economic phases of this question at this time, nor do I intend to follow the example that has been set by others upon this floor—to talk upon every other subject except the one under consideration. I believe in a closure rule. So far as I have observed, there is too much talk in this House and too little business. [Applause.] I have heard Members of this House—without criticizing them—I have heard Members of this House spend one hour on measures not under consideration, without paying the least attention to the business under consideration. That may be a part of the usual proceedings here, and of course that is the reason why Congress is in session during six or seven months in the year.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Twelve months.

Mr. CANTOR. Twelve months, I am reminded. That was pardonable in that session of Congress, because we had two most important bills before the extraordinary session of this Congress. But go over the history of past Congresses, when there was not legislation of that great and vital importance pending, and you will find sessions that occupied six, seven, or eight months. There is no reason why so much time should be consumed on legislation of that kind.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to special rules at this stage of the session, as I said at the outset. This bill is of great importance. There is some demand for it, as has been stated; but greater protests against it have arisen from all over the country, and almost from the foundation of this Government down to this hour there have been vigorous protests against the passage of any such un-American measure as this. Yet year after year in Congress there has been the same old cry to pass it because of economic conditions, and yet the country has grown great and powerful. I am opposed to the adoption of this rule. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Speaker, I am mindful of the fact that no amount of debate will change the already formed determination of the House to pass this rule. But I desire to register my protest against it. There is no occasion for this unseemly haste. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT], chairman of the Committee on Immigration, rushed this bill through the Committee on Immigration faster than I have ever seen any bill rushed through that committee. He held that committee together day after day, until one day he held it from 10 o'clock in the morning until 2 o'clock the next morning, only to continue the consideration of the bill at 10 o'clock of the same morning. [Applause.]

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise? Mr. MOORE. I wish to ask the gentleman, Did not that "day after day" amount to two days only?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Practically that. Now, Mr. Speaker, we are told that there is a demand for this bill. Looking over the history of the country, we find that from the earliest times the cry of restriction has been raised. From time to time every foreign class and nationality was decried and their exclusion asked without rhyme or reason. It was reserved for two Presidents of this country—President Cleveland first and President Taft afterwards—to veto these very restrictive measures as the pending bill provides. The Congress of the United States, called upon under the Constitution to determine whether the bills should pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding, determined that the bills should not pass. While other and greatly more important measures are awaiting our attention there is no reason for the Rules Committee to give this special privilege to those in favor of restriction.

It was said by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] that he had hoped that we would get rid of a Democratic administration. Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, if we pay attention to the messages sent in by the President who now presides over the destinies of this Republic, President Wilson, and give our first attention to legislation along the lines which he suggests, if we give consideration to the real important, burning issues of the hour, we ought not take up this immigration measure now in preference to all these other important, pressing matters. It may well await the orderly procedure of the House under the general rules that this House has enacted. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, seeing no purpose whatever in rushing through this measure or in giving it preference over the measures that claim the attention of statesmen of the land, measures intended for the betterment of the conditions under which this country now labors, I shall cast my vote against this special rule. [Applause.] I reserve the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has one minute. If no gentleman desires to speak, the Chair will put the question.

Mr. HARDWICK. I was just suggesting that the gentleman can not reserve his time. We are entitled to conclude, and we have but one speech.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman from New York wishes to use his one minute remaining, the Chair will recognize him to give the time to somebody.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to utilize that one minute just to ask a question.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I yield one minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MOORE. I want to ask the gentleman from New York if in addition to the vetoes by President Cleveland and President Taft he might not also add utterances of President Wilson as opposed to this kind of legislation?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Certainly.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. I should like to ask the gentleman from Alabama whether he predicates the necessity for this bill on the condition of unemployment in the country under this Democratic administration? [Applause.]

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, if my time has not expired—

The SPEAKER. Why, the gentleman quit, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MURRAY] used up the rest of his time.

Mr. HARDWICK. I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, this is too important a question to undertake to bandy political epithets in its discussion. It is a question that rises away above party issues. It is a question upon which Democrats and Republicans agree and may disagree, and therefore in the discussion of this rule, which is the only question before the House, I decline to be brought into any controversy of that kind.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. CANTOR] has spoken of the fact that we have several months ahead of us. Gentlemen here well remember last year when he had months ahead of us and were trying Wednesday after Wednesday to get up this bill on Calendar Wednesday, how one kind of an objection, one kind of a scheme of filibustering after another, was resorted to until the bill had to go over into the short session.

Mr. Speaker, it is a matter that demands action now. [Applause.] That is why we want action now. If gentlemen would read the statements of Mr. Morrison before the Committee on Immigration in favor of the bill in that unseasonable hour that the gentleman from New York spoke of at 2 o'clock in the morning, they will realize the necessity of immediate action. Mr. Speaker, I could not have held the Committee on Immigration together if they had not wanted to stay. The gentleman from New York does me too great an honor. There were seven Democrats and several Republicans willing to stay there and battle for the demands of labor until the wee small hours in order to get this bill before the Congress of the United States. [Applause.] That is why we were there. Mr. Morrison, in his statement, introduced a record showing that in the last four months 639,482 aliens have come into this country.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURNETT. I can not yield; I have only five minutes.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. I only had two.

Mr. BURNETT. Let me say about this rule that it is the gentleman from New York's rule, and it is infinitely fair. Gentlemen opposed to this bill are to have three and a half hours, and yet a little while ago there were 238 voting in favor on our side and only 132 against us; and yet you are to have one-half of the time. Gentlemen, your mouths are certainly closed. Mr. Morrison showed that there was an immediate necessity for this measure, and there has been a great cry and need for it for years. Last year 1,400,000 aliens came in; the year before more than a million; and last year and during the last six or seven years there have been seven or eight millions coming to this country. Within the last four months over 600,000 have come in. The gentleman from Colorado the other day, in discussing the conditions out there in that strike, showed that these very conditions were brought about by the importation of that class of labor which this bill seeks to keep out.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] said that there is no demand for it. I call his attention to the fact that the Federation of Labor, with 3,000,000 members, every year and for several years has demanded the passage of this bill. I call his attention to the fact that for the last five years the Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of the South and West have demanded it by resolutions and unanswerable arguments before the House Committee on Immigration. I have just received resolutions from the State Farmers' Union of Indiana and Illinois demanding it, and we have demands from all over the North and West and South that this legislation be passed, and that it be passed speedily. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that more than 500,000 members of the great patriotic organizations of the country, and hundreds of thousands who belong to no organization, are knocking at the doors of Congress, just as they have been knocking for years, and been refused, until last year, and then it was vetoed by a President who only received the electoral votes of two little States in the November election. [Applause.]

Now the gentleman from New York says that this bill is in conflict with the statement of the present President of the United States.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. How about President Cleveland?

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I hope I have time to call attention to the fact that when President Cleveland vetoed the bill in 1897 there were not as many people coming from all Europe as to-day are coming from southern Italy. In regard to the statement of our President, Mr. Speaker, in answer to questions that were propounded to him in New York, he said that those that came here induced and incited by the steam-

ship companies to come here ought to be kept out, and this bill keeps out that very class of people that the President of the United States said ought to be kept out. [Applause.]

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] stated that there were 102 votes "against us" and thereby places me as one against this bill. Since I voted against the previous question a moment ago, the gentleman has no right to make such a distinction.

The SPEAKER. That has nothing to do with this matter, and it is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BRYAN. I wanted to say that I am for this immigration bill, including the literacy test, and I am not going to permit myself to be recorded against it.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DONOVAN. The regular order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is the parliamentary inquiry of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. May I inquire whether or not under the terms of this rule Monday will be given up to the consideration of this bill?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will rule on that when the time comes.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. But it might have something to do with the vote that will be cast on this rule.

The SPEAKER. The Chair can not help that. When debate is over and that question presented, the Chair will rule. The Chair has not had time to consider it.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays on the adoption of the rule. I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry as to the proposition to be submitted.

The SPEAKER. The primary proposition is the substitute, and if that is adopted the vote will be on the original resolution as amended by the substitute.

Mr. HARDWICK. It is a committee substitute?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, can we have the substitute reported?

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will report the substitute.

There being no objection, the Clerk again reported the substitute.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, may I ask also that the Clerk again report the original resolution?

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the original resolution.

There was no objection, and the Clerk again reported House resolution 378.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the request for the yeas and nays on the substitute.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the substitute. The substitute was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on agreeing to the resolution as amended by the substitute.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 224, nays 108, answered "present" 3, not voting 98, as follows:

## YEAS—224.

Abercrombie	Callaway	Evans	Hamilton, N. Y.
Adair	Campbell	Faison	Hamlin
Adamson	Candler, Miss.	Falconer	Hammond
Aiken	Cantrill	Farr	Hardwick
Alexander	Caraway	Ferris	Hardy
Allen	Carr	Fess	Harrison
Anderson	Church	Fields	Hart
Anthony	Clark, Fla.	Finley	Haugen
Ashbrook	Claypool	Floyd, Ark.	Hawley
Aswell	Clayton	Foster	Hay
Baltz	Collier	Fowler	Hayden
Barkley	Connelly, Kans.	Francis	Hayes
Bartlett	Covington	French	Heflin
Barton	Cox	Gard	Helm
Bathrick	Crisp	Gardner	Helvering
Beakes	Cullop	Garner	Henry
Bell, Cal.	Curry	Garrett, Tenn.	Hensley
Bell, Ga.	Danforth	Garrett, Tex.	Hinds
Bowdle	Davenport	Gillett	Holland
Brockton	Davis	Glass	Houston
Browne, Wis.	Decker	Godwin, N. C.	Howard
Browning	Dent	Goeke	Howes, Ga.
Bryan	Dershem	Good	Humphrey, Wash.
Buchanan, Ill.	Dickinson	Gray	Humphreys, Miss.
Buchanan, Tex.	Dies	Greene, Vt.	Jacaway
Burnett	Dixon	Gregg	Johnson, Ky.
Butler	Doolittle	Griest	Johnson, Utah
Byrnes, S. C.	Doughton	Gudger	Johnson, Wash.
Byrns, Tenn.	Edwards	Guernsey	Keister
	Elder	Hamilton, Mich.	Kelly, Pa.

Kennedy, Iowa	Mondell	Rothermel	Stevens, N. H.
Kent	Montague	Rouse	Stout
Kettner	Moon	Rubey	Summers
Kliss, Pa.	Morgan, Okla.	Rupley	Switzer
Kindel	Morrison	Russell	Taggart
Kinkaid, Nebr.	Moss, Ind.	Saunders	Taggart
Kirkpatrick	Murray, Okla.	Scott	Taylor, Ark.
Knowland, J. R.	Neely, W. Va.	Seldomridge	Taylor, Colo.
La Follette	Nelson	Shackleford	Temple
Langham	Nolan, J. I.	Sharp	Ten Eyck
Langley	O'Hair	Sims	Thomas
Lee, Ga.	Oldfield	Sinnott	Thompson, Okla.
Lenroot	Padgett	Sisson	Tribble
Leshner	Page, N. C.	Slayden	Underhill
Lever	Palmer	Slomp	Underwood
Lewis, Md.	Park	Sloan	Vaughan
Lewis, Pa.	Patton, Pa.	Smith, Idaho	Walker
Lindbergh	Payne	Smith, J. M. C.	Watkins
Linthicum	Plumley	Smith, Md.	Watson
Lloyd	Post	Smith, Saml. W.	Weaver
McGuire, Okla.	Pou	Smith, Tex.	Whaley
McKenzie	Quin	Sparkman	White
McLaughlin	Rainey	Stedman	Williams
MacDonald	Raker	Stephens, Cal.	Wilson, Fla.
Maguire, Nebr.	Rayburn	Stephens, Miss.	Witherspoon
Mapes	Reilly, Wis.	Stephens, Nebr.	Young, N. Dak.
			Young, Tex.

NAYS—108.

Ansberry	Eagan	Loneragan	Phelan
Barnhart	Edmonds	McAndrews	Platt
Bartholdt	Esch	McCoy	Reed
Booher	Fitzgerald	McDermott	Reilly, Conn.
Borland	Fordney	McGillicuddy	Riordan
Britten	Frear	McKellar	Roberts, Mass.
Brown, N. Y.	George	Madden	Rogers
Brumbaugh	Gilmore	Mahan	Sabath
Bulky	Goldfogle	Maher	Scully
Burgess	Gordon	Manahan	Sherley
Burke, Wis.	Goulden	Mann	Sherwood
Cantor	Green, Iowa	Mitchell	Shreve
Chandler, N. Y.	Greene, Mass.	Moore	Smith, Minn.
Coady	Hamill	Morgan, La.	Stafford
Connolly, Iowa	Howell	Moss, W. Va.	Steenerson
Cooper	Igoe	Mott	Stevens, Minn.
Copley	Kahn	Murray, Mass.	Stone
Crosser	Kennedy, R. I.	Norton	Talcott, N. Y.
Dale	Kinkead, N. J.	O'Brien	Tavener
Deitrick	Konop	Oglesby	Taylor, N. Y.
Dillon	Lafferty	O'Leary	Thacher
Donohoe	Lazaro	O'Shaunessy	Thomson, Ill.
Donovan	Lee, Pa.	Paige, Mass.	Townsend
Driscoll	Levy	Patten, N. Y.	Wallin
Dunn	Lobeck	Peters, Mass.	Walsh
Dupré	Loft	Peters, Me.	Waldruff
Dyer	Logue	Peterson	Woods

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3.

Fergusson	Porter	Towner
-----------	--------	--------

NOT VOTING—98.

Ainey	Curley	Johnson, S. C.	Richardson
Avis	Difenderfer	Jones	Roberts, Nev.
Balley	Dooling	Keating	Rucker
Baker	Doremus	Kelley, Mich.	Sells
Barchfeld	Eagle	Kennedy, Conn.	Small
Beall, Tex.	Estopinal	Key, Ohio	Smith, N. Y.
Blackmon	Fairchild	Kitchin	Stanley
Borchers	FitzHenry	Korbly	Stephens, Tex.
Bremner	Flood, Va.	Kreider	Stringer
Brodbeck	Gallagher	L'Engle	Sutherland
Broussard	Gerry	Lieb	Talbot, Md.
Brown, W. Va.	Gittins	Lindquist	Taylor, Ala.
Bruckner	Goodwin, Ark.	McClellan	Treadway
Burke, Pa.	Gorman	Martin	Tuttle
Burke, S. Dak.	Graham, Ill.	Merritt	Vare
Calder	Graham, Pa.	Metz	Voistead
Carew	Griffin	Miller	Walters
Carlin	Helgesen	Morin	Webb
Carter	Hill	Murdock	Whitacre
Cary	Hinebaugh	Neeley, Kans.	Willis
Casey	Hobson	Parker	Wilson, N. Y.
Clancy	Hoxworth	Powers	Wingo
Cline	Hughes, W. Va.	Prouty	Winslow
Conry	Hulings	Ragsdale	
Cramton	Hull	Rauch	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina with Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania.

Mr. BEALL of Texas with Mr. CRAMTON.

Mr. CARLIN with Mr. HELGESON.

Mr. CLANCY with Mr. HULINGS.

Mr. CLINE with Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia.

Mr. DOREMUS with Mr. LINQUIST.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia with Mr. PARKER.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois with Mr. POWERS.

Mr. LIEB with Mr. SUTHERLAND.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas with Mr. TREADWAY.

On this vote:

Mr. WINGO (for rule) with Mr. BARCHFELD (against).

Mr. PROUTY (for rule) with Mr. TUTTLE (against).

Mr. AINEY (for rule) with Mr. CURLEY (against).

Mr. PORTER (for rule) with Mr. MORIN (against).

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas (for rule) with Mr. TOWNER (against).

Mr. L'ENGLE (for rule) with Mr. BRUCKNER (against).

Mr. WILLIS (for rule) with Mr. METZ (against).  
 Mr. BLACKMON (for rule) with Mr. WINSLOW (against).  
 Mr. SMALL (for rule) with Mr. DOOLING (against).  
 Mr. KITCHIN (for rule) with Mr. CALDER (against).  
 Mr. AVIS (for rule) with Mr. KENNEDY of Connecticut (against).

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan (for rule) with Mr. MILLER (against).  
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. Under the resolution the House will automatically resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6060, the immigration bill.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the immigration bill, with Mr. HAY in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6060, the title of which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 6060) to regulate the immigration of aliens to, and the residence of aliens in, the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the first reading of the bill will be dispensed with.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have order, and I would like to state at the outset that I understand it has already been the announced policy of some gentlemen to keep a quorum here, and I hope that Members will be here, because it is apparent from what occurred a little while ago that one gentleman, at least, will resort to filibuster. So I hope the gentlemen will be near enough, if the point of no quorum is made, to be here without having a call of the House and delay us half an hour every time.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. BURNETT. I will.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I trust the gentleman's criticism is not directed against any of the members of the Committee on Immigration or any of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. BURNETT. I have not seen any indication of that kind, Mr. Speaker, either by members of the Committee on Immigration or of the Rules Committee.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BURNETT. I desire further to state, Mr. Chairman, I hope that we may get through with general debate on this bill to-night. It will only hold us here until something like 9 o'clock, or a little after, and by doing that we can be able to get through with the bill to-morrow—that is, the reading of the bill under the five-minute rule—and I very much hope that gentlemen will be patient and stay with us until this matter is concluded to-night, so far as general debate is concerned.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman, is there such pressing necessity that the House should stay in session to-night for general debate on this bill?

Mr. BURNETT. Well, the necessity is that the bill ought to be passed, and if we do not get in to-night and to-morrow, why then, if the Speaker rules that we can not come in Monday, we will go over until Tuesday; and then, if the same tactics were resorted to that were resorted to a while ago, that may carry us over until Thursday. Gentlemen are called away; there is a committee going to leave here in a few days—10 men—to make investigations that have grown out of conditions that never would have been, perhaps, if this bill had been adopted in 1906, when we tried to pass it here.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURNETT. I will.

Mr. GARNER. Is it not also essential that the House should get through with its work within a very reasonable time, that these bills must be passed and the business of appropriations must be carried through?

Mr. BURNETT. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. And is it not a further fact that appropriation bills are now ready to be reported into the House which are to be passed? In regard to this matter of seven hours' general debate, gentlemen who are interested in it ought to remain here a sufficient length of time to get through with it in one legislative day.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will yield, it is rather early in the session to have protracted night sessions. I have no desire to delay the final disposition of this bill. As far as I am concerned, I am perfectly willing to help expedite it, and hope we may soon get through with the work of the session; but I do not see how the gentleman can expect to have the House remain in session this afternoon and to-night, probably without a quorum, if he proposes then to keep the House in session again to-morrow night until maybe Sunday morning in order

to pass the bill. I wondered if it is practical to get some kind of an understanding.

Mr. BURNETT. I shall ask the House when we adjourn to-night to adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow, and in that way we will utilize another hour of time.

Mr. MANN. Of course, the gentleman knows at this stage of the session committees have a good deal of work in the morning, and I do not know how far that may interfere with the work of committees.

Mr. HAMILL. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAMILL]?

Mr. BURNETT. I do. But first, a parliamentary inquiry. I trust it will not be taken out of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has no control over it. The time of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] is now running.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that it shall not be taken out of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is proceeding under the rule, and so is the committee.

Mr. MANN. This is not general debate.

Mr. HAMILL. Since this is probably the most important bill of the session in a sense, since it involves the fate of the Democratic Party, is there any particular reason that the Republican chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER], should want to hurry this bill through in seven hours?

Mr. BURNETT. I would like to know what the gentleman means by that question.

Mr. HAMILL. I mean precisely this: I want to know who is the chairman of the Committee on Immigration, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] or the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER]?

Mr. BURNETT. I regard that as an infamous insult, and resent it as such. Now, sit down! I do not propose to be interrupted by anyone who does not know the amenities of this House. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama declines to yield.

Mr. HAMILL. I want to ask the gentleman a respectful question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama declines to yield, and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAMILL] will take his seat.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I understood the gentleman from Alabama to say he wanted to go on with general debate to a later hour than usual and begin at an early hour in the morning.

Mr. BURNETT. General debate to-night and to meet at 11 o'clock in the morning.

Mr. MADDEN. I shall insist on a quorum being here if the committee desires to stay longer than 6 o'clock, and if it desires to meet before 12 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I think we can reach no agreement in regard to this matter, and therefore I yield to my colleague, Mr. SABATH.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield? And is the gentleman now debating the bill? Because, otherwise, the Chair would be compelled to hold under the rule—

Mr. BURNETT. I am not debating the bill, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SABATH. I desire to ask the chairman of the committee the following question: If there is no point of quorum raised—and it is not my intention that anyone on this side should raise the point of no quorum—would the gentleman still insist on going on this evening until all of the time given under the special rule is consumed? I ask that for this reason: There are several gentlemen on this side who desire some time and who desire to speak in opposition to this bill, and it is absolutely impossible for them to be here to-day. I was under the impression that ample opportunity would be given them to-morrow, and one or two of them have left, and if we should go on and consume all of the time they will be precluded from making their remarks against this bill.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I desire now to proceed—and I answer that question by stating that several gentlemen made the same request of me and I told them they must stay if they wanted to get into the debate, because we wanted to get through with the general debate to-night. I must ask the Members, if they will do so, to remain with us, so that we can keep a quorum in order to conclude general debate to-night.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] is recognized for one hour. [Applause.]

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MOORE. An hour has been accorded the gentleman without any understanding as to the division of the seven hours fixed by the rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will see that both sides get an equal part of the seven hours accorded for debate.

Mr. MOORE. A parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MOORE. What does the Chair mean by "both sides"? There are three sides to this question now.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands there is a bill pending on which the gentleman will either vote "yea" or "nay," and gentlemen are either for it or against it, and the Chair will recognize gentlemen who are for it for three hours and a half and the gentlemen who are against it for three hours and a half.

Mr. MOORE. May I make a further parliamentary inquiry?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MOORE. The Chair recognized the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] as being in control of the time up to date.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not. The Chair recognized the gentleman from Alabama for one hour, and the gentleman from Alabama can use that hour himself or yield it to other gentlemen if he so desires.

Mr. MOORE. Well, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] represents one side. May I—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thoroughly understands that.

Mr. MOORE. May I ask the Chair who represents the other side?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOLDFOGLE] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania himself and other gentlemen are on the other side, and the Chair will recognize one of those gentlemen for one hour after the gentleman from Alabama gets through.

Mr. MOORE. Then we are to go on with the understanding that several gentlemen represent the other side as named by the Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will not depart from the rule.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time be equally divided under the rule, and that one half be controlled by myself and the other half be controlled by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that that would be very agreeable to the Chair, but that it can not be done in the Committee of the Whole. It will have to be done in the House.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, does the Chair hold that the rule did not provide for the division of the time?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not hold anything of the kind. The Chair held that three and one-half hours of the time devoted to general debate would be yielded to gentlemen in favor of the bill and three and one-half hours yielded to gentlemen opposed to it. The Chair will undertake to do that. The Chair thinks he has fully answered the parliamentary inquiry of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] is recognized for one hour.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, another parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MOORE. Since a number of applications have been made to the gentleman from Pennsylvania for time in which to discuss this bill, may I ask the Chair whether I shall come direct to the Chair to obtain that time?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MOORE. Then we are left out in the cold, so far as an opportunity to debate this question is concerned?

The CHAIRMAN. That is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] can not take the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] off his feet by a parliamentary inquiry, anyhow, after he has been recognized.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is correct.

Mr. MANN. Oh, we do not want to quarrel among ourselves unnecessarily. As I understood, the Chair stated that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] would be recognized for one hour.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] yield?

Mr. BURNETT. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. The Chair stated he would recognize the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] for one hour in opposition to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not state that.

Mr. MANN. That is what I understood the Chair to state.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair intends to recognize the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be called at the expiration of half an hour, and then I can yield my time, can I?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has control of his time, and can do what he pleases with it.

Mr. BURNETT. Then, Mr. Chairman, at the end of that half hour, when I had reserved the remainder of my time, would a gentleman on the other side have a half hour?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize some other gentleman on the other side at the end of an hour. Then the gentleman from Alabama, at the conclusion of that hour, if it is all used up, can use the balance of his time.

Mr. BURNETT. I can use the rest of my time after some other gentleman's time has intervened?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. If, for instance, at the expiration of an hour, allotted either to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] or to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], the speaker on the floor, under arrangement with either of the gentlemen controlling that time, should not finish, and yet have an agreement to continue on, would not the Chair recognize that gentleman in order to finish his remarks? You see, he might have, for instance, 15 minutes to go on. The Chair, under the proposition already made by him, would cut that 15 minutes in half, possibly, and thus interrupt the orderly speech of whoever occupied the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would not cut a gentleman off while he was debating the question if he had the time yielded to him. The Chair can only recognize a gentleman for the time that has been yielded to him either by somebody who has control of the time or by the Chair himself.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Precisely; but if, for instance, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] yielded, say, 15 minutes to some one, and within those 15 minutes the hour that the Chair had allowed expired, then the Chair would recognize the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] again, who was opposed to the gentleman from Illinois, and then through until it became the turn of the gentleman from Illinois?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would not yield to the gentleman 15 minutes of an hour. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] will proceed.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, this bill is essentially the same as the bill that passed this House and passed the Senate last year and was vetoed by President Taft. The only material difference is the exclusion of a class not embraced in the other bill. This bill, after providing for the exclusion of anarchists and others who are also deportable if they should come in, adds to the excludable and deportable class those who advocate or teach the unlawful destruction of property. That is to keep out a class of people who come teaching and preaching a species of anarchy that probably is not embraced under the law as it now stands.

I desire to call attention to the material changes that this bill makes in the existing law. As I have stated, it is substantially the same as the bill that we passed last year, but it makes considerable changes so far as the existing law is concerned.

Under the existing law the head tax is \$4. By this bill the head tax is increased to \$5.

Under the existing law stowaways—those who may be stowed in the holds of vessels—under the rulings of the department, can steal in and can not, perhaps, be deported after they have come in. This bill embraces them among the general class of the excludable and deportable. However, we make an exception in favor of those people that where they come in in that way and the case is not a bad one it is left in the discretion of the Secretary of Labor to permit them to come in just like other immigrants, if they are admissible under the law governing other immigrants.

We provide also for the exclusion of those who come in by advertisement. The law is considerably enlarged and strengthened in that respect.

We add to the excluded class those who can not become eligible to become citizens, unless otherwise provided for by treaties and conventions. We think that will reach a class of those who are coming into the Pacific coast—Hindus and other Asiatics who ought to be kept out.

We have also the literacy test, which is the real bone of contention in the entire bill. In fact, I have had intimations from

gentlemen opposing the bill that with that left out they would be willing to take the rest of the bill. In my judgment that is the part of the bill that is the most essential and necessary.

Heretofore skilled labor has been admitted, but in this bill we make an amendment. The law as it now stands says that skilled laborers are to be admitted where skilled labor of a like character can not be found in this country. We make the same exception in favor of skilled labor in this bill, but we allow the question to be tried first as to whether skilled labor of like kind is found here before the skilled laborer is admitted. In practical execution it was found sometimes that skilled laborers would come to this country, and then the question would have to be gone into and decided as to whether there really was skilled labor of like kind in this country to be had, and if it was found that there was labor of that kind to be had those laborers were deported after having been brought here and put to great expense. We have changed that so as to permit a trial or a hearing upon that question in advance, and we allow anyone who feels aggrieved by the decision of the Department of Labor to appeal to the courts of the country within a certain time in order to have that question adjudicated.

The wives and minor children of citizens are admitted, even if they are aliens, which is a change in the law.

Penalties are imposed upon transportation companies for assisting immigrants. We have laws and regulations against the assisting of immigrants, but in some cases there are no penalties and in other cases the penalties are not regarded as high enough. We have changed the rule in regard to the admissibility of alien insane. They have been excludable heretofore, but there has been no penalty upon the steamships for bringing them in. By this bill we penalize the steamships for bringing in insane aliens. We have increased from \$100 to \$200 the penalty for bringing in many other inadmissible aliens.

We have added a penalty for harboring those who are inadmissible by transportation companies and others.

We provide a penalty of \$25 for bringing in aliens who are so afflicted as to affect their ability to earn a living. Those are excludable aliens, but sometimes the defects are such that we thought possibly there ought not to be so heavy a penalty for bringing that class, and hence the penalty has been placed at \$25.

A penalty of \$100 is imposed for bringing in those who are unable to read and who can not become citizens by naturalization. That penalty was not made so large as the penalty for bringing in insane and diseased people.

Section 11, page 19, provides for inspection by inspectors, matrons, and surgeons of ships carrying immigrants. The whole committee was unanimous that that was a wise provision, although it has aroused the ire of some of the nationalities on the other side. We have received protests from several Governments through the regular channels against this provision. We guard it very carefully. We do not allow conditions to arise under the law so that there would be a confusion of authority. The inspectors and surgeons and matrons must be permitted to go through and examine the condition of immigrants on the ships, but they have no authority to go as far as to order changes. If they had the power of making and enforcing orders on the ships, we thought there would be confusion of authority between our inspectors and surgeons and those employed by the steamship companies or put on the ships by other countries. Hence we believe that while there is objection by some countries to this provision, it is wise to leave it in the discretion of the Secretary of Labor, and that the discretion will not be abused.

Section 16 provides for more competent inspection and for inspectors searching vessels. It also gives the inspectors power to require the attendance of witnesses. They are not allowed to issue subpoenas or exercise proceedings for contempt, but if the witnesses refuse to come in response to request they can apply to the courts of the country for process to secure the attendance of witnesses.

We provide more effectively for the deportation of those who are excluded, and put a higher penalty upon the steamship companies for refusing to deport them after this Government has ordered that it shall be done.

Another very wise provision is for interior immigrant stations. The Secretary of Labor at his discretion may establish other interior immigrant stations and provide an inspector to accompany aliens arriving at the ports of this country to the interior stations. That amendment was made because we found in many cases ignorant aliens and alien girls coming here from abroad and starting on a long journey into the interior would fall into improper hands and have trouble on the way. We found that those who got in from the borders to reach interior stations were often abused or defrauded, and by this amend-

ment the Government protects them in a way that they could not have under the law as it now exists.

We have also several sections providing for vessels furnishing lists of alien seamen and for the deportation of deserting seamen. It was found and so held by our court that when alien seamen were employed on ships and came to this country in the ships they could go ashore and desert those ships and get in without any kind of inspection and escape restrictions in that way. Hence, in order to meet that trouble we provide that the steamships must furnish a list of the members of the crew and that they shall furnish a list of those who go ashore and lists of those that have departed, and if anyone has deserted the ship within their knowledge they are required to furnish a statement thereof. We found that some of the smaller steamship lines were engaged in traffic of that kind, employing men on the other side in mental positions, allowing them to come to this country as a part of the crew of the ship, and when they got here, perhaps paying a consideration to get here, they were people that would have been deported, but coming in in the way they did and deserting, mingling with the masses of our people, in that way escaped detection and were let in.

Those are the principal changes that we have made in the bill outside of the literacy test.

Now I desire to read and briefly comment upon the literacy test. It is:

All aliens over 16 years of age, physically capable of reading, who can not read the English language, or some other language or dialect, including Hebrew or Yiddish: *Provided*, That any admissible alien or any alien heretofore or hereafter legally admitted, or any citizen of the United States, may bring in or send for his father or grandfather over 55 years of age, his wife, his mother, his grandmother, or his unmarried or widowed daughter, if otherwise admissible, whether such relative can read or not; and such relative shall be permitted to enter. That for the purpose of ascertaining whether aliens can read the immigrant inspectors shall be furnished with slips, of uniform size, prepared under the direction of the Secretary of Labor, each containing not less than 30 nor more than 40 words in ordinary use, printed in plainly legible type in the various languages and dialects of immigrants. Each alien may designate the particular language or dialect in which he desires the examination to be made, and shall be required to read the words printed on the slip in such language or dialect. No two aliens coming in the same vessel or other vehicle of carriage or transportation shall be tested with the same slip. That the following classes of persons shall be exempt from the operation of the literacy test, to wit: All aliens who shall prove to the satisfaction of the proper immigration officer or to the Secretary of Labor that they are seeking admission to the United States solely for the purpose of escaping from religious persecution; all aliens in transit through the United States; all aliens who have been lawfully admitted to the United States and who later shall go in transit from one part of the United States to another through foreign contiguous territory: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall exclude, if otherwise admissible, persons convicted of an offense purely political, not involving moral turpitude.

Mr. Chairman, this is not an attack upon the moral character especially of the men and women who can not read. I know that all over this country there are hundreds and thousands of good men and good women that are illiterate, and especially in the section of the country from which I come, because we have not yet arisen entirely from the depleted condition in which my people were left at the end of the Civil War.

Mr. Chairman, that is not the proposition involved, but the commission that was appointed seven years ago to investigate this question arrived at the conclusion, every member of that commission, including Mr. Bennet, of New York, himself, who dissented from the manner that the majority of the commission thought we ought to provide for restriction, that there should be substantial restriction. The commission reported:

The investigations of the commission show an oversupply of unskilled labor in basic industries to an extent which indicates an oversupply of unskilled labor in the industries of the country as a whole, and therefore demand legislation which will at the present time restrict the further admission of such unskilled labor.

It is desirable in making the restriction that—

(a) A sufficient number be debarré to produce a marked effect upon the present supply of unskilled labor.

(b) As far as possible, the aliens excluded should be those who come to this country with no intention to become American citizens or even to maintain a permanent residence here, but merely to save enough, by the adoption, if necessary, of low standards of living, to return permanently to their home country. Such persons are usually men unaccompanied by wives or children.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. BURNETT. I desire respectfully to decline to yield until I have concluded this statement, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, the commission then names several methods that could be adopted for that purpose, and concludes:

All these methods will be effective, in one way or another, in securing restrictions in a greater or less degree. The majority of the commission favor the reading and writing test as the most feasible single method of restricting undesirable immigration.

Mr. Chairman, we have not included the writing test, because the record shows that only a few thousand a year who come in are able to read and are unable to write, and hence it would

make very little difference in the number coming; but the commission arrived at that conclusion, and that is the common sense of the proposition—that the unskilled class of labor that come here with low standards of wages, that come here with low standards of living, could be kept out more feasibly by a literacy test than by any other test or provision.

Mr. Chairman, whom would this bill exclude and whom would it let in? It would not keep out the splendid German people that come to this country, the magnificent Scandinavians, who have built up the great Northwest. Not one in a thousand of these would fall under the ban of the reading test. It would not keep out the English or the Irish, the Welsh, or the Scotch. The record shows that less than 1 per cent of those great nationalities would fall under the rule and be excluded. It would not keep out 2 per cent of the Germans or the Hollander, it would not keep out 1 per cent of the Bohemians, it would not keep out the Frenchman or the Switzer; but, Mr. Chairman, it would strike down fifty-odd per cent of those from southern Italy, from along the borders of the Mediterranean Sea, from Sicily, and the islands of the Mediterranean.

Oh, but some gentleman says this bill would not keep out the leaders of the Black Hand. That is true. We have never contended that it would. There are other laws that we have to meet that. That is a mere pretext of gentlemen to say that it does not strike at the really dangerous element of the country; but it will keep out those who are the dupes and tools in the hands of the Black Hand leaders. It would keep out those who, at Lawrence, Mass., during the strike last year, were following the flag of Black Hand leaders, the followers themselves unable to read their own language—those who had inscribed upon the banners by the leaders they blindly followed "No law, no God, no master." That is the class at which this bill is leveled. It would keep out about 30 per cent of the Poles, about 40 per cent of the Greeks, some 60 or 70 per cent of the Turks, and the other day I received a letter from Dr. Wightman, of Providence, R. I., who, I believe, is at the head of the State charities there, and an expert on insanity, which letter I shall put in the Record, in which he says that recently hundreds of Turks and Kurds—and in reply to an inquiry of mine as to what the Kurds were, he said they were the people from Kurdistan, and similar to Turks—were coming there while hundreds of good men were out of employment, taking the jobs of men who wanted to toil, but who were not willing to labor at the standard of wages paid to those people, and he says the literacy test would not only keep them out now, but it would do so for the next thousand years.

The other day one of the great leaders of the Federation of Labor, Mr. Morrison, the secretary of that federation, stood before our committee pleading for this bill, and he said:

Mr. Chairman, I speak not only for the natives, but I speak for thousands of men of every nationality who believe that our first duty is to take care of those whom we already have.

Our sympathies may go out across the sea, as he so well said. My friends, the old saying that charity begins at home certainly ought to pervade the minds of the American Congress. Who are asking for this bill? Thousands and thousands of men like him who want to better conditions in our own land; thousands and thousands of men who follow the plow in the West and in the South; thousands and thousands of men who belong to the patriotic organizations of the country; thousands and thousands of men who belong to the National Grange and the National Congress of Farmers of the North. All over the country you hear the cry for this needed legislation coming up, and, Mr. Chairman, you scarcely hear opposition to it except from those who themselves by their environment do not dare to vote for this bill, no matter how much they believe that it is right.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield? Mr. BURNETT. Just for a question.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. Has the gentleman from Alabama conferred with his colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] as to the extent of opposition to this measure in Massachusetts?

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I have not. No doubt the gentleman will take care of himself in regard to that. I decline to yield further, because my time is almost up. How much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has four minutes remaining of the half hour.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, without taking this out of the gentleman's time, everybody knows that where debate is fixed like this it is desirable, if possible, to have it within control. Would it be satisfactory to arrange, not contrary to the rule, so that the gentleman from Alabama should have his time extended so as to make a total of three and a half hours and

the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] an hour and three-quarters and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] an hour and three-quarters. If the time can be so controlled, it is much more satisfactory.

Mr. BURNETT. It would be satisfactory to us, sir.

Mr. SABATH. Personally I am perfectly satisfied that the time should be so divided.

Mr. MANN. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that the time of the gentleman from Alabama be extended two and a half hours beyond the one hour to which he was entitled.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Alabama be extended two and a half hours beyond that to which he has been already recognized. Is there objection?

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I do not desire to object if the committee has that power after this rule has been adopted; but it occurs to me, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. MANN. The committee has power to extend the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the committee would have power to extend the time of the gentleman.

Mr. BARTLETT. Of the gentleman from Alabama, no question about that; but as I understood the gentleman's request—

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. I understand, of course, it is part of that agreement that the gentleman may yield to other gentlemen if he so desires.

Mr. MANN. That is the rule of the House.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. That is the rule, but I thought probably the gentleman's unanimous consent might change that.

Mr. MANN. That is part of the rule.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. I know, but the gentleman is preferring a unanimous request.

Mr. MANN. By extending the time it gives him the right to do that.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I only want to get this correct as to precedents, because if we violate the rule in one instance—

Mr. MANN. I am not going to violate the rule.

Mr. BARTLETT. I understand the request now is that the time of the gentleman from Alabama be extended.

Mr. MANN. That is it.

Mr. BARTLETT. I have no objection to that, of course, but the gentleman made some other suggestion.

Mr. MANN. I hope nobody will object; the other comes later.

Mr. BURNETT. Now, Mr. Chairman, may I have unanimous consent that this be not taken out of my four minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. FOSTER. Just a minute, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman object?

Mr. FOSTER. I want to reserve the right to object for a moment.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to understand the proposition. This extends the time of the gentleman from Alabama how much?

Mr. MANN. Two hours and a half beyond the hour to which he was entitled. It gives him all the time in favor of the bill.

Mr. BURNETT. In order, as I understand, that I may yield it to those who desire.

Mr. FOSTER. Does it extend the time beyond the seven hours?

Mr. MANN. It does not.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] has four minutes remaining.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] may be extended three-quarters of an hour beyond the hour to which he is now entitled, he having been recognized.

The CHAIRMAN. As a matter of fact, the gentleman has not yet been recognized.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] said he would reserve his time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] is recognized for one hour, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] asks unanimous consent that that time be extended three-quarters of an hour. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MOORE. I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] is recognized for an hour.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] have his time extended three-quarters of an hour.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] asks that the time of his colleague [Mr. SABATH] be extended three-quarters of an hour. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve my time.

Mr. BURNETT. I desire to proceed for the remainder of my four minutes now.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman reserve the balance of his time?

Mr. BURNETT. I desire at the expiration of four minutes to reserve the time.

Mr. Chairman, this is not an extreme measure. It is a conservative bill; but if gentlemen continue to play with this subject as they have been trying to do for years the time will come when it will be more serious to them and to this country than it now appears to be. Already labor organizations are, some of them, going much beyond what we are asking for. Just the other day the United Mine Workers of America passed a resolution at Indianapolis demanding that all immigration be stopped for the present. They asked for laws to prohibit all immigration until all surplus laborers in the United States are fully employed.

Mr. Chairman, this bill strikes at those who come here for the purpose of beating down the price of labor, who come here for the purpose of establishing low standards of morals and living, and to drive out, as Mr. Morrison says, those who desire to make an honest living and maintain their families in decency and self-respect.

The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING] the other day portrayed the conditions in that State when he spoke of the old miners being driven out, those who were Scotch and Irish and English and Welsh, as well as Americans and that class of people, by the south Italians. They, in turn, are being driven out by the Mexicans, and 90 per cent of the Mexicans would fall under the ban of this bill.

Last year every Member from Kansas on this floor received a letter from a gentleman connected with one of the great railroads in that State asking them to vote against this bill, because they said they had to have those Mexicans as laborers. Whose places do they take? They take the places of Americans and former immigrants from the other countries of Europe.

This bill is not aimed against the Jews, as I have said before, because we allow them, if they can read their Yiddish or Hebrew, or if they are fleeing from religious persecution, to come in. A distinguished Jew from the East Side, New York, said last year to me that there is not 1 per cent of the Jewish people but that can read their Yiddish Bible. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] is recognized.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman who has preceded me, the chairman of the committee, has called your attention to some of the changes in this bill. However, he has omitted to state one very important change in the very first section of the bill—on the very first page. The change which he has omitted to state is that which designates or defines the work of an alien.

This bill provides that the immigration laws shall apply to all aliens and it defines an alien as any person not native born or a naturalized citizen.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we have in this country thousands and thousands of honest men of foreign birth who, on account of the harsh naturalization laws, have been unable to become citizens of this country, although residing here for many years. Frequently these men who leave in the country from which they have emigrated a father or a mother or other relative are obliged to return abroad for a short time, possibly to see their parents for the last time and to bid them good-by before they set out on that long journey from whence none of us return. It matters not whether these people have resided in this country for 5, 10, 15, or 20 years, Mr. Chairman. If this bill should become a law, upon their return they would be subjected to the same regulations as those immigrants upon their first journey to our shores.

Mr. GARDNER. Is not that the law now by interpretation in the case of Lapina versus Williams to-day?

Mr. SABATH. Well, I do not think that the Supreme Court has gone that far. But that is one of the changes that has not been explained to you by the chairman.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] states that organized labor and the patriotic orders of

America and other organizations demand this legislation. I maintain that the demand for this legislation comes from sections of our country to which immigration does not go.

I am convinced that whatever demand there may be appears only in certain sections of the country where it has been artificially created, and where the citizens are not familiar with the great benefits derived from immigration.

The prejudice against immigration which exists in the minds of many of our citizens is the direct result of the campaign carried on by a well-organized lobby maintained in the Capital at a great expense by the Restrictive Immigration League, aided and abetted by the Junior Order of American Mechanics and the Patriotic Order of Americans. The views of these organizations on the question of immigration are the same as those of the old American Protective Association, whose members were known also as the Know-nothings.

True, the Farmers' Alliance and the American Federation of Labor have gone on record as favoring the passage of this measure, but neither organization submitted the matter to a referendum vote in order that the true sentiment of the rank and file of these bodies might be ascertained. Had they done so I am confident that the recommendations of the officials would have been reversed.

It has been stated repeatedly that all of these immigrants go to New York and to the other large centers. Have we heard any demands from these centers to which the immigration does go? Have we heard that demand from the city of New York, or from the city of Chicago, or the city of Cleveland, or the city of Buffalo, or the city of Boston, or the city of San Francisco, or any of those other centers?

No, Mr. Chairman, the demands are made from men coming from sections of our country that have not been blessed with immigration. Every section of our country that has received immigration is perfectly satisfied and willing to receive more of it.

Oh, yes, we are told that the labor organizations are on record, and that they demand this restricted immigration because labor has suffered in consequence of that immigration. For the benefit of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] and other gentlemen who are advocating this measure I desire to call his attention and the attention of the House to the following facts:

During the last 10 years it has been admitted that immigration has been larger than ever before in the history of our Nation, and yet, notwithstanding that fact, Mr. Chairman, the conditions of labor have improved and the wages of labor have increased. I have here a short statement that I desire to read, and I will take not only the figures from 1900 down to the present time, but I will go back to 1890 and compare them with the figures of 1912. Let us see what the statistics show.

In silk industries the hours of laboring men have decreased 5.8 per cent and the wages have increased 18.8 per cent.

In the lumber manufacture the hours have decreased 3.8 and the wages have increased 29 per cent.

In millwork the hours have decreased 5 per cent and the increase in wages is 33 per cent.

In the furniture-manufacturing business the hours of laboring men have, from 1890 to 1912, decreased 7.3 per cent and the wages have increased 34 per cent.

In the boot and shoe industry the hours have decreased 6.4 and the wages have increased 34.8 per cent.

In the hosiery and knit-goods industry the hours have decreased 7.9 and the wages have increased 36 per cent.

In the woolen and worsted industries the hours have decreased 6.3 and the wages have increased 49.7 per cent.

In the cotton-goods manufacturing establishments the hours have decreased 8.1 and the wages have increased 61 per cent.

But, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] may say there are railroad organizations in this country that are on record against immigration, and that this immigration has brought about conditions that are unbearable in that line of industry. Now let me, in the brief space of time that I have, call your attention to the following figures:

In 1892, before this so-called "undesirable" immigration commenced to come to our country, the section foremen were receiving \$1.76 per day. To-day they are receiving \$2.07 a day. The carpenters were receiving \$2.08; to-day they are receiving \$2.54. Other shopmen were receiving \$1.72, and they are now receiving \$2.24. The trainmen, who had been receiving \$2.29, to-day are receiving \$2.88. Firemen who were receiving \$2.08 in 1892 are now receiving \$2.94. Mechanics who were then receiving \$2.08 per day are now receiving \$3.14 per day. Engine-men who were then receiving \$3.08 are now receiving \$4.79. Conductors who in 1892 were working for \$1.90 are now re-

ceiving \$4.16 per day. Now, I ask you in all fairness, have the laboring people of this country suffered from immigration? You must all admit that they have not. The conditions of labor have improved steadily; and I say to you, coming from the largest labor center in this country—

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Does not the gentleman know that that increase in wages has been largely due to organized labor?

Mr. SABATH. Yes; it has; and if it had not been for the foreign element we would not have organized labor in this country. [Applause.] Samuel Gompers, the great labor leader, came here as a foreigner. The present Secretary of Labor, the Hon. William B. Wilson, was born abroad. The majority of the members of the executive committee of the American Federation of Labor, the men who have aided and assisted Mr. Gompers in the organization and perfection of that great body, are of foreign birth. If credit were given to those who deserve it, we would find that immigrants have been instrumental in the organization and development of practically all of the great labor organizations of the present day.

Mr. HENSLEY. The gentleman does not mean to intimate that Secretary Wilson would have been embarrassed at all by this law, does he?

Mr. SABATH. I do not know whether he would or would not. The chances are that he might have been, because I do not know what his financial condition was when he came over. I know that I would have been embarrassed and that I could not have landed if the law that you propose now had been in force in 1882. I did not possess \$25, nor did I possess, perhaps, some of the other qualifications that some of the gentlemen now desire these immigrants to possess. [Applause.]

Mr. BURNETT. Does the gentleman intimate that there is a \$25 requisite in this bill?

Mr. SABATH. That is the rule of the department which is being enforced.

Mr. BURNETT. That is not in this bill.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman from Alabama knows it is being enforced.

Mr. BURNETT. No; I do not. Secretary Wilson voted for this bill at the last session, foreigner though he was, did he not?

Mr. SABATH. I think he did; but if he had taken the time that he ought to have taken to study the conditions of this bill carefully, I do not believe, from what I know of him, that he would have voted to deprive others of the same opportunity that was accorded to him.

Mr. LINTHICUM. The gentleman says he does not know the financial condition of Secretary Wilson when he came over here, and whether he could have come in under this bill that is now pending. Does this bill make any change from the present law, so far as financial qualifications are concerned?

Mr. BURNETT. Not a bit.

Mr. SABATH. It does in this way: It increases the head tax. When Secretary Wilson came over here there was no head tax. In this bill you have increased the head tax from \$4 to \$5.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Was not the head tax increased in a previous law, which is now on the statute books, to \$4?

Mr. SABATH. Yes; but this bill provides for a head tax of \$5.

Mr. LINTHICUM. That is an increase of \$1 then?

Mr. SABATH. Yes. I must hurry on, for my time is limited. If I had the time I am sure I could answer all the questions that the gentleman could ask, and I feel confident that before the gentleman would get through asking questions he would feel that he ought to vote in the interest of the unfortunates who are endeavoring to come to our shores and partake of the benefits and blessings of this free country of ours.

Mr. Chairman, it has been stated that the present-day immigration is not the same immigration that we received years ago; that the Englishman, the Welshman, and the Frenchman are not coming; and that this new immigration is not of the same standard. I desire to say, Mr. Chairman, that within the last 15 or 20 years the new immigrants have demonstrated to the country that they are as good as those that came to this country a hundred years ago. One of the gentlemen said the immigration we received a hundred years ago was first class. For his and your benefit I will read a part of the report which was made on the question of immigration from the managers of the Society for the Prevention of Pauperism in New York City, in 1819, nearly 100 years ago. What did they say? They said in part as follows:

First, as to the emigrants from foreign countries, the managers are compelled to speak of them in language of astonishment and appre-

hension. Through this inlet pauperism threatens us with the most overwhelming consequences.

Again, later on they say:

This country is the resort of vast numbers of those needy and wretched beings. Thousands are continually resting their hopes on the refuge which she offers, filled with delusive visions of plenty and luxury. They seize the earliest opportunity to cross the Atlantic and land upon our shores. What has been the destination of this immense accession to our population, and where is it now? Many of these foreigners have found employment, some may have passed into the interior, but thousands still remain among us. They are frequently found destitute in our streets; they seek employment at our doors; they are found in our almshouses and in our hospitals; they are found at the bar of criminal tribunals, in our Bridewell, our penitentiary, and our State prison. And we lament to say that they are too often led by want, by vice, and by habit to form a phalanx of plunder and depredations, rendering our city more liable to increase of crime and our houses of correction more crowded with convicts and felons.

That is what those gentlemen had to say about the immigration that came to our shores nearly 100 years ago, and which the gentleman from Alabama spoke of so highly.

Mr. Chairman, the objection to immigration is not new, as you will observe. The same class of people, yes, the same sections of our country that objected to these immigrants 100 years ago are found now again advocating and demanding restriction. I say to them, if they would have more immigration, if they would receive at least a part of it, I can assure them they would not favor restriction. Immigration has been a great blessing and benefit to the country, and I feel confident that the immigrants that are to come will measure up with the old immigrants which helped to build up our country. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, in an effort to prejudice the minds of the American people the restrictionists have asserted that the foreign Governments are aiding emigration to this country. This is an unmitigated falsehood; these Governments, far from encouraging emigration, are doing everything possible to prevent it, knowing as they do that they are losing annually thousands of their best citizens. They maintain, and properly so, that emigration robs them of the young, healthy, and ambitious men and women, just the very kind they would like to retain within their borders.

Statistics will show that during the past 10 years over 80 per cent of our immigrants have been between the ages of 14 and 45. This clearly indicates that we are receiving immigrants in the prime of life, men and women who are producers, and who will create wealth. It has been estimated that to raise a child to the age of 14 years costs approximately \$1,000; think, then, of the billions of dollars that these incoming aliens represent.

In order to maintain the progress of this great Nation it is imperative that we do not further restrict desirable immigration. The industry of the country requires the labor of the foreigner, and the presumption that the immigrant is a competitor of our American labor is erroneous. On the contrary, the employment of immigrant labor creates a demand for a better grade of labor, and it is productive of better wages for the American workman. The work performed by the immigrant is that of the hardest kind, work of a character for which it is well-nigh impossible to secure American labor, yet work which nevertheless must be performed.

Some of the restrictions would have us believe that at present there is practically no regulation of immigration, and that, with very few exceptions, every individual who seeks admission is successful in his quest. For the benefit of these gentlemen and others who may have been misled by these statements, I would like to state that during the fiscal year of 1911-12 there were over 16,000 immigrants denied admission to our country, while there were over 1,000 deported who had been admitted on probation, as it were, and who were forced to leave because of circumstances arising subsequent to their admission.

I also desire to call the attention of these gentlemen to the fact that at the present time we exclude all idiots, imbeciles, feeble-minded persons, epileptics, insane persons, and persons who have been insane within five years previous; persons who have had two or more attacks of insanity at any time previously; paupers; persons likely to become a public charge; professional beggars; persons afflicted with tuberculosis or with a loathsome or dangerous contagious disease; persons mentally or physically defective, such mental or physical defect being of a nature which may affect the ability of such alien to earn a living; persons who have been convicted of or admit having committed a felony or other crime or misdemeanor involving moral turpitude; polygamists, or persons who admit their belief in the practice of polygamy; anarchists, or persons who believe in or advocate the overthrow by force or

violence of the Government of the United States, or of all government, or of all forms of law, or the assassination of public officials; prostitutes, or women or girls coming into the United States for the purpose of prostitution or for any other immoral purpose; persons called contract laborers who have been induced or solicited to migrate to this country by offers or promises of employment or in consequence of agreements, oral, written, or printed, expressed or implied, to perform labor in this country of any kind, skilled or unskilled; those who have been, within one year from the date of application for admission to the United States, deported as having been induced or solicited to migrate as above described; any person whose ticket or passage is paid for with the money of another, or who is assisted by others to come, unless it is affirmatively and satisfactorily shown that such person does not belong to one of the foregoing excluded classes and that said ticket or passage was not paid for by any corporation, association, society, municipality, or foreign Government, either directly or indirectly; all children under 16 years of age unaccompanied by one or both of their parents, at the discretion of the Secretary of Commerce and Labor or under such regulations as he may from time to time prescribe.

The supporters of this measure will tell you that by adopting the literacy test we will keep out a great portion of those coming from southern Europe, and that we will therefore secure more desirable immigration.

Mr. Chairman, literacy is not a test of character, of honesty, industry, or integrity. There are several European countries that make it impossible for their subjects to receive an education, but because of this fact are we to shut our doors in the faces of these people when they seek to enter this country in order that they may attain that which they have been deprived of in their native land? To assume such an attitude would be to place our stamp of approval upon the despicable practices of these foreign countries.

It is said that illiteracy is an objection. I can prove that the children of illiterate parents exhibit a keener interest in their studies, are more anxious to acquire an education, and receive higher grades than those whose parents have been more fortunate.

In a bulletin just issued, Commissioner of Education Claxton states that—

The least illiterate of our population are the native-born children of foreign parents.

And again, he says:

Illiteracy among the children of native-born parents is three times as great as that among native-born children of foreign parents.

Mr. Chairman, due to immigration our country is the wonder of civilization. Its population is made up of all the people of the earth. We have here all races, all religions, all nationalities. They have come to us from all quarters of the globe, and we have the best. Only those with the courage to face away from their native country and the homes of their birth, their kindred and friends, to set out for an unknown land, where the language they spoke was not understood and with nothing to beckon them on but the beacon light of human liberty, are the ones who have sought to make this country their home. They aimed to establish themselves where the tyranny of monarchy, the oppression of caste, and the insolence of titled wealth would not place their heavy feet upon their throats. They brought with them their courageous hearts and adventurous spirits, their strong arms, their industries, and the culture, genius, and wisdom resulting from centuries of civilization in the lands beyond the seas, and they gave them here to us and we have become the wonder and envy of the world. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that now, when our country prospers as never before in the history of our existence, that it will not reverse the policies which have been instrumental in making it the leading Nation of the world, and that it will always remain an asylum for the oppressed and persecuted of all nations. [Applause.]

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Tulley, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bill of the following title:

H. R. 9317. An act to regulate the payment of postal money orders.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing

votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 32) to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge in and for the eastern district of Pennsylvania.

RESTRICTION OF IMMIGRATION.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MANAHAN].

Mr. MANAHAN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the point has been made here that the enemies of this bill, in its literacy test, are hostile to the cause of labor. Now, I will yield to no man in this Chamber a higher regard for labor than I have. I will not concede that any man is a truer friend of labor than I am. If it would help the cause of labor to keep out the victims of the unjust laws of their countries who can not read, I would be tempted, regardless of the injustice of the matter, to favor this legislation. I will admit that my record in Minnesota has been such as probably would justify the charge that I am unfair in my advocacy of labor and unjust to the great corporations of that State.

In every great contest we have had up there for many years—in the fight of shippers against the railroads for fair rates, in the contest of labor unions in every fight they have had, in the fight of the farmers against the grain combine of the States, and in every great contest where on one side was arrayed the forces of monopoly and on the other side the struggling toilers—I have been found consistently on the weaker side. The laboring men of Minnesota know, all the people of Minnesota know, that in every industrial conflict of public importance I have been on the weaker side—the side of labor. And when the chairman of the Committee on Immigration tries to stampede this House, tries to take advantage of the timidity of some Members on this floor, continually attempts to flaunt in our faces the statement that this is a labor bill and that those opposed to it are enemies of labor, he is unfair—unfair and unjust—especially to me; because I oppose this measure with all the energy I have, not as an enemy of labor but as a friend of labor. Nor will I yield to a single labor-union man a higher regard nor a deeper concern than I have for those who toil. I am a farmer's son, one of a race of toilers. I carry the marks of hard work, the awkwardness of the country, upon me. My heart is with the struggling poor. I confess some bitterness toward the hypocrites who cover wicked greed by a cloak of wealth and good-mannered respectability. I do not hate wealth or capital as such. I hate its abuse of power. I love labor because my father and my mother came here as humble immigrants and by hard work built a home. I am one of 12 children, and all that I have of character or education I owe to the labor and love of my immigrant father and mother. My devotion to the toilers is only the natural expression of myself. I am one of them. It has not been mere profession with me—an idle lip service such as you heard from the advocates of this bill; they talk loudly for labor, but it is all talk.

I have done things for labor. This bill only makes deceptive promises. What I have done for the poor entitles me to speak for the poor. In the contest against the transportation companies of the Northwest by the shippers, whom I represented, sweeping reductions in rates were secured which were confirmed in the famous Minnesota rate case, and which will save the consumers of my State over \$3,000,000 annually. The great fight against the express companies for a reduction of their rates, which I tried for Sen. Sundberg, a Scandinavian immigrant farmer of my State, resulted in sweeping reductions which will be put into effect to-morrow all over the United States, and which will mean a saving to consumers of the country of not less than \$25,000,000 a year. I tried the Pullman sleeping-car case, which lowered the price of all upper berths, without retainer or fee of any sort, simply as the people's lawyer and for the sake of justice. Further, I say this: I feel so keenly upon this subject of labor, and realize so fully the injustice which laboring men and women endure, that I would be tempted—I hope I would not yield to the temptation—to be recreant and unjust to the spirit of American institutions and to vote for this bill were any convincing reasons offered or any sort of proof made that labor conditions would be improved. I know that it is stated and claimed that the literacy test will help the cause of labor by reducing the total number of immigrants who come to this country, and that by reducing the number of immigrants you lessen the competition of laboring men and improve their condition.

I take issue with both propositions, and I will ask gentlemen who attempt to defend this bill to give something like a reason why this bill would actually result in restriction in number of immigrants in the face of the admitted facts that the steamship

companies, for the purposes of traffic, are largely responsible for the incoming of the immigrants in such large number. No man with respect for his reputation or judgment will take issue with my statement when I say that the great trans-Atlantic steamship companies are largely responsible for the vast number of immigrants who come to our shores. Will this literacy test handicap these companies to any considerable extent in view of the profits they make annually from steerage passengers? Certainly not. It will simply divert their efforts. Instead of seeking immigrants from the peasantry of Europe, the more rural places where there is a humbler and less educated people, they will concentrate their efforts in the great cities of the old country and still have their carriage capacity full of steerage passengers. The number will not be lessened materially, but the character of the immigrants will be lowered decidedly. Is there any question about that? I want to ask the advocates of labor what character of immigrants do they have most to fear—the peasantry of Europe who are more inclined to go to the country and fitted for agricultural work, those who naturally as time goes by become engaged in agriculture, or, on the other hand, do they most fear the city dwellers of the old world, the men who can meet this little test of reading 25 words? It must be obvious that this test will exclude the humbler peasantry from the most oppressed portions of Europe, but permit the incoming of those who can meet the test, often the most vicious and dangerous men from the congested cities, always the least desirable character of immigrants. Therefore you do not by this literacy test improve the condition of labor at all so far as number of immigrants is concerned, but you do place labor in jeopardy by bringing men from the cities of Europe, who, because of their city dwelling and wrong conception of life, are more apt to be a menace to our institutions and a handicap upon labor than the farmers are. [Applause.]

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANAHAN. Yes.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. I will subscribe to the gentleman's statement in regard to his sincerity and advocacy of the cause of labor.

Mr. MANAHAN. I thank the gentleman for his indorsement.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Would it not be fair for the gentleman to state that the conditions under which we are living now make it practically impossible for these foreigners to get on the land, and there are only about 2 per cent who are able to go on the farms of our country?

Mr. MANAHAN. I also thank the gentleman for asking that question, and I will be very glad to answer. I will be glad also to answer any question that any gentleman may desire to ask. As to the suggestion about the number that go to the farm under the present economic conditions of this country, I will state that there is a great difficulty in diverting the incoming immigrants to the agricultural sections of the country, but making the point of this difficulty is begging the question, because if our social conditions are such, and if our economic conditions are such, and if our laws are such as to cause an unhealthy congestion in the cities of the country, the fault is ours and not the fault of the incoming immigrants. [Applause.] It belittles the intelligence and patriotism of this Congress if it has not the capacity to grapple with those great social and economic questions in a way that will solve them rightly and divert to the agricultural sections of the country the great streams of immigration which constantly flow in our direction and to our already congested centers. It would be well for the country if we had such intelligence and skill here as legislators as would bring about a change in our unhealthy economic conditions, a change in our methods of distribution, a change in our laws and social affairs so that the incoming immigrants, instead of congregating in great centers as they do now, to the hazard and jeopardy of all the people, would go out on the land and cultivate the land and produce crops for the hungry mouths of our Nation. [Applause.]

That is what we need. Instead of the blind and narrow point of view as expressed by the literacy test in this bill, the statesmanlike point of view of it would be to admit freely the humble toilers from the land of Europe who come here and are capable of assimilating with our people and who are sound in body and mind and to place them where they can live their lives for the betterment of themselves and their families and for the general upbuilding of the wealth of this Nation. That would be statesmanship, and when labor-union leaders take the narrow point of view that they can not better their condition as labor-union men except by putting an artificial restriction on the incoming immigrants, and when they fail to take into consideration the legislation necessary to change the laws which have

been passed in this Capitol and which have permitted the intolerable monopolies of this country to grow, and when they fail to realize the need of controlling absolutely the great laws of taxation like railroad freight rates, which are nothing but transportation taxes, and the gambling in wheat and cotton, and stock watering and manipulation, and all that which tends to the congestion of money, and consequently people also, and immigrants as well, in the great centers—when they fail to grasp the larger issues, it is natural for them to make too much of the narrow point of view and become blind to their own best interests. Now, I say this with perfect respect. I have an affection for the great labor leaders of this country. They are heroic men. They have suffered abuse and wrong. I know Mr. Gompers and Mr. Morrison, and I know the other great leaders, Mr. Hayes, Mr. Wills, Mr. Fitzpatrick, and Mr. McNamara, who appeared before our committee. I respect their point of view, but I confidently make the suggestion that in their narrow point of view they are the victims of their own environment for years. What has that environment been? A constant uphill, heart-breaking fight for labor-union recognition and a decent wage for labor-union men.

Mr. QUIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANAHAN. Certainly.

Mr. QUIN. Does not the gentleman think a large element of this influx of immigration into this country has a deteriorating effect on the community in which they might be lodged?

Mr. MANAHAN. I do not; I think the opposite is true. I will be obliged to the Chairman to notify me when 25 minutes of my time is up. I will say why I do not. As I understand this query, it is simply this: Does not this incoming immigration have a deteriorating effect upon the body politic by the incoming of this great mass of immigrants? How can we decide that question? By any sort of theorizing? No; we must decide that question by consulting the records of this country. We decide it by measuring the effect upon the different communities of this country by the immigrants who have come. We decide it by comparing those sections of the country that have had a large influx of immigrants with those sections— which possibly the gentleman represents; I do not know—to which a very small number of immigrants have come, and when considered in that way and such a comparison is made I unhesitatingly assert that the salvation of this country, its virility, nobility, and power, has been largely from the immigrants who came in such great numbers from the lands across the sea. [Applause.] I do not hesitate to say—

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANAHAN. Yes.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. I take it, from the remark the gentleman made a few moments ago, that the shipping interests now are inducing immigration here in large numbers. I am convinced that is true, and that the big manufacturers—

Mr. MANAHAN. The gentleman's question?

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. And trusts are in collusion with them, and should not the laboring men be protected from this exploitation by these big business, shipping, and manufacturing interests?

Mr. MANAHAN. Certainly.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Is not the best way to restrict that immigration, so that we can bring about a better condition?

Mr. MANAHAN. No; and the gentleman from Illinois, as a labor-union man himself and because of his industry and zeal in investigating labor conditions, should know it would not protect laboring men in this country to restrict immigration of illiterates, for the simple reason that these great industrial trusts for whom the laboring men work do not concern themselves at all with sentimental reasons. It is just a matter of supply and demand with them, and they could and would exploit and enslave poor Poles or Jews or Italians or Greeks who could read a little just as heartlessly as they would exploit and enslave an illiterate Turk or Bulgarian.

The labor-union leaders have considered only one-half of this question. I will come to the other gentleman's question when I conclude this point. They have considered only one side of the question, and that is the objection I urge to their point of view. They have always, because of their experience, been confined largely to contests between union labor and nonunion labor men, and have had their minds entirely devoted to the question of maintaining the labor-union movement. At the hearing Mr. Morrison admitted in answer to my question that he had never considered the broader economic aspects involved in the question of immigration and restriction. He confided to the committee that as to the effect on labor of restricting the number of consumers and therefore narrowing the market for the prod-

ucts of labor as restrictions to immigration would, and the effect on labor of shutting off and restricting the number of men who go to the farms to dwell or of draining the farms of farmer boys as the cities would if emigration were shut off to any great extent, he had not considered those aspects of the question at all. And right in this connection I desire to refer to the opinion and deliberate judgment of Mr. Louis F. Post, the Assistant Secretary of Labor of the United States. [Applause.] I know you will concede, gentlemen, that as a man of powerful scope of mind, broad and clear comprehension of every great problem of government, magnificent zeal and devotion to human rights, he has not a superior in the United States. [Applause.] Now, Mr. Louis F. Post, the Assistant Secretary of Labor, who has dedicated his life and splendid intellect to ameliorating the conditions of the humble men of the earth, stands uncompromisingly opposed to any sort of restriction on good, sound, honest-minded men and women of Europe. He even criticizes in his own paper the hardened, artificial bureaucratic manner in which the department at present enforces the law. I believe in his wisdom; I would rather follow his judgment than that of the active leaders of labor unionism, and I say in this connection that the great rank and file of the laboring men of this country have never declared in favor of this bill. [Applause.] They have never had a referendum of any sort or form on this literacy test. The leaders, as I have shown, are divided, and the rank and file have never yet considered it.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANAHAN. Certainly.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Has the gentleman from Minnesota overlooked the fact that a few days ago the miners' convention, now in session in Indianapolis, adopted a resolution calling upon this Congress to prohibit altogether immigration until the labor of the country was employed?

Mr. MANAHAN. I can conceive that a convention of that kind, under the stress of the difficulties that are upon them, might be led astray by a few of their zealous leaders who had never considered both sides of the question; but I venture the statement that if Mr. Post or I had had an opportunity to speak before that convention and to tell them how these restrictions would affect labor and the cost of living and general prosperity the resolution would have been entirely different. It is easy to stampee a convention of that kind. They are assembled for other purposes, are considering special grievances, and are anxious, almost to the point of mental paralysis, as to the hopelessness of the long struggle for life. It is very easy to get them to take a particular side of a question on the mere suggestion of a leader in whom they have confidence. Untrained men are so prone to consider only the obvious and direct effect of any law proposed. Their fear of competitors blinds them to the fact other toilers working in any other line of work are not competitors but customers.

Now, I take it to be just as important to laboring men to have a market for their product as it is to have employment, because if there is no market for their product they have no employment. In other words, it is just as hard upon a poor man who toils to be put out of his job because there is no market for the product of his toil as it is to be put out of his job by an immigrant. It is the same thing. He is out of his job in either event. Suppose in 10 years 10,000,000 immigrants come to this country. That means an increase of 10 per cent of consumption upon the production of this country. It means that every manufacturer has a 10 per cent better home market for the products of his factory. Every man engaged in manufacturing as a laborer knows there would be a home market for a larger proportion of what he produces by his labor. It helps, not hurts, toilers making things to enlarge their market by increasing population.

But that is only one side, and a lesser side, of this point of view. I wish to dwell particularly, because I represent a great farming constituency, on the effect of this bill ultimately, if it becomes a law, upon agriculture in this country. And, to my mind, our greatness as a people, our stability as a nation, our very existence as a forward-moving race of men in the long years to come depends very much upon the maintenance of happiness out in the open places of the earth, where food for the race is grown and where saviors of men are cradled.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANAHAN. I regret that I can not.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. The gentleman has made an erroneous statement, I think.

Mr. MANAHAN. Just a moment, Mr. BUCHANAN. I must finish this before I yield to another question. I say it is just as

important to the laboring men to have a low cost of living as it is to have a high wage, because what the laboring man makes net at the end of the year is the gross income of his labor less the cost of operating expenses, the cost of living to him and to his family; so that any legislation that tends directly to increase the cost of living to the toilers of the city is adverse to the cause of labor.

Nobody will dispute that proposition. I repeat it, that any legislation that has a direct tendency to increase the cost of living by increasing the price of food or of anything else produced by agriculture has an adverse effect upon labor.

Now, then, it is true that in my own State of Minnesota not one-third of the tillable soil of the farms is cultivated, and even the farms that are under cultivation are not cultivated to anything like the full extent of their productivity. And why? Because of a lack of labor.

If the great farms of this country had the proper supply of labor, it would decrease the cost of living 25 per cent to the toilers in the towns and cities. The farmers could raise larger crops at less expense per unit and therefore sell cheaper. Does not that affect the cause of labor? Does it not mean anything to labor?

Suppose you were to keep out all immigrants. What would be the effect? The great industrial establishments and business enterprises of the large cities of the country will keep drawing more and more for their necessary help on the farmers of this country and increase the number of young men who come from the country to the cities. What will be the effect of that? The effect will be that some farms will be abandoned and other farms untilled. And what will be the result? Obviously the price of farm commodities will go up and up and up because of the tremendous pressure of consumption upon what they raise; and although this will not help the farmer, because of the high cost of his help, the consequence will be that the toilers in the towns will have a harder time than ever.

Why? Because they have done two things by restrictive legislation—they have cut off millions of men who would have been a market for their products, and they have cut off other millions of men who would go to the fields of this country and help produce the food they require to live.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MANAHAN] has consumed 25 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANAHAN. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. What is the effect of immigration in large communities on the standard of living in those communities?

Mr. MANAHAN. I forgot about that, and I want to make a statement right now in that connection. I call the attention of the chairman of the committee [Mr. BURNETT] to this fact, so that if he desires to answer me he may: Every single community in this country that has had a large influx of immigration has had a better manhood and a better womanhood than communities that have not had it. [Applause.] And I base that statement upon the extreme test of the gentleman's own bill. I take it that the chairman of the committee is very much obsessed with the idea that the true test of citizenship is the ability to read and write, otherwise he would not dwell so much upon it. He seems to believe that the ability to read and write is the supreme standard of good citizenship. Now, then, I took occasion to look at the district represented by the chairman of the committee, who thinks so much of that test, and I found a singular thing. One of the counties in the gentleman's district, Cherokee County, has actually lost population in the last 20 years. Again, in Cherokee County the number of illiterates—not the negro illiterates, but the native white illiterates—according to the figures taken from the census reports of the gentleman's own district, amounts to 20.2 per cent illiterate white natives. In Cullman County the percentage is 11. In Dekalb County the percentage is 12.3. In Etowah County, where the gentleman lives, the percentage of white illiteracy is 14.3. In Franklin County the percentage is 17.4; in Marshall County the percentage is 12.7; in St. Clair it is 13.5; and in Winston it is 12.6, making an average of approximately 13 per cent illiterates—a larger percentage of illiterates—whites—living in the district represented by the gentleman from Alabama than the average of the illiterates of all the foreign-born whites in the United States. [Applause.]

Now, right in this same connection I challenge the attention of the House to the fact that the percentage of native white illiterates of my State, the State of Minnesota, is one-half of

1 per cent, showing that they are over 25 times as literate as the citizens of the gentleman's district.

Seventy-five per cent of the total population of Minnesota consists either of immigrants or the children of immigrants, and the illiteracy of the entire population of that State is exactly 3 per cent. Why, we would have just as much right in Minnesota to clamor for legislation, if it were constitutional, to restrict the coming into that State of the whites from the district of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] as he has to clamor for legislation to restrict immigration from Europe. [Applause and laughter.] And I say to him now deliberately, after studying the statistics of his State and the statistics of the States of other gentlemen who are in favor of this bill, which statistics I am prepared to give, that it would be a good thing for the mentally atrophied whites of those States if they had the advantage of coming into contact with the live, red-blooded southern Italian and Sicilians, because it would at least stimulate them to a little activity in their gray matter. [Applause and laughter.]

I would like to say more on this subject, but I can not.

I will go into detail for a few moments, however, as to the population of Minnesota. I think it will be very interesting. I will give some of the larger figures. We had in 1910 in that State: Germans, 396,859; Norwegians, 279,608; Swedes, 268,018; Irishmen, 72,775; Russians, 30,277; Italians, 13,007; Scotch, 12,655; Hungarians, 8,560; Hollanders, 8,934; French, 4,482; Belgians, 3,161; Greeks, 1,840. These figures cover our immigrants and their children. We have also a good many other foreigners, and altogether they make a constituency of which any man has the right to be proud. [Applause.] I invite a comparison of their character and accomplishments with any people anywhere on earth. I say with a great deal of pride that this virile and diversified constituency saw fit to send me here to speak for them and for the whole State by a vote of over 2 to 1 of the whole State, and I now do speak for them in this debate. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANAHAN. I would like three minutes more, if I can have it.

Mr. MOORE. I yield the gentleman 10 minutes. [Applause.]

Mr. MANAHAN. I desire especially to emphasize the comparison between my State and its citizenship and the work they have accomplished with the State, the citizenship, and the accomplishments represented by the chairman of the committee, Mr. BURNETT, now forcing this bill through Congress by the weapons of fear and prejudice. Of course, when I suggested on the literacy-test basis that Minnesota would have a better right to object to a migration of native whites from Alabama I did not imply that we would object, for our spirit is not mean or intolerant regarding our neighbors. We would be delighted to welcome the charming men and women of Alabama, even though so many of them can not read or write, because we have the faith born of experience that as soon as they came in contact with our vivacious, bright-eyed, delightful citizenship from the art and music loving countries of Greece, Italy, and Poland the inbred staleness of the South would yield, and I believe their children, at least, would make a fair showing. I called your attention to the fact that at least the first county named in Mr. BURNETT's district has suffered a loss in population during the past 20 years. If the chairman correctly reflects the attitude of his constituents on this question, I am not surprised that as a people they are retrograding. They evidently think that the fewer people there are in a country the more wealth it will have, which is an absurd fallacy and easily disproved. Again referring to the census reports for comparison, I note that there are over 60 per cent of the farms of Alabama operated by tenants, while only 21 per cent of the farms of Minnesota—page 635, Minnesota supplement—are operated by tenants. The total value of our farm property is over \$1,476,000,000, while that of Alabama is only \$370,138,000, although the farm acreage included in the farms of Minnesota is about twenty-seven million and odd thousand, while that of Alabama is twenty million and odd thousand.

Over one-half of our farmers are foreign-born whites, and it is significant that of our tenant farmers we have over twice as many who are native whites as of those who are foreign whites. In Alabama 57½ per cent are native whites and one-half of 1 per cent are foreign-born whites.

I do not know that the farms of Minnesota are more productive than the farms of Alabama. Assuming that they are equal in natural resources, it must be admitted that the difference in results is attributable to the superior qualities of husbandry demonstrated by our immigrants. Not only have the immigrants and their children demonstrated great capacity to

produce for the benefit of the whole Nation, but likewise a wonderful capacity to assimilate and learn. On page 239 of the Census Abstract the following significant statement is made:

The lowest percentage of illiteracy, 1.1 per cent, was among the native whites of foreign or mixed parentage, while among the native whites of native parentage the percentage was 3.7 per cent.

These are the figures for the whole country, and they show beyond question that foreign immigrants from Europe are more solicitous for the education of their children than the native whites of this country—three times as solicitous and earnest in the matter of education and good citizenship. Not only are these children of immigrants diligent in acquiring education, but extremely proficient as well. The Italian children bring to the public schools very superior qualities of artistic perception which not only enable them to distinguish themselves in literary expression and all kinds of creative work requiring for its development a high order of imagination, but serve as a stimulus and incentive to the orderly minds of more deliberative nationalities. The world, of course, recognizes the scientific accuracy of the German mind and the brilliant capacity of the Greek and French, but it may not be generally known that the children of Scandinavian immigrants to this country have in consequence of their splendid capacity for hard work and great power of continued application won and maintained in our higher institutions of learning an unequalled general average of scholarship and attainment. The press reports of the Northwest during the past week have told the significant story of little Anna Nerli, who won first place in arithmetic for the whole city of Minneapolis. She is but 12 years old, but has completed the eight grammar grades in six years, and is spoken of by the educators of Minneapolis as being one of the best all-round pupils that the city has produced. She is the daughter of Norwegian immigrants whom radical restrictionists would have excluded from our shores if they could have done so.

Over one-third of a million of the thrifty and substantial German stock are scattered all over our State, and wherever they are are contributing every day to the happiness and wealth and the general good of the whole State. Over half a million of the enterprising and tireless Scandinavian race, who, with the same spirit of daring and adventure which made vikings of them in the olden days, did not hesitate to attack the difficulties of the boundless prairies of our far Northwest when many thought it was folly to do so, have not only subjugated a splendid empire of raw land, but have created all over it homes of prosperity and culture. And all the time this great people, while accomplishing this arduous work of subjugation, have steadily absorbed our best principles of government and our most progressive and enlightened ideas of political economy, so that now every reform and every movement for the uplift of humanity has their sure and uncompromising support. Our immigrants from Italy and Greece, as well as from Holland, Belgium, England, Scotland, Ireland, though less in number than the great races of northern Europe, have swung into the procession of progress and good citizenship and have not in any degree lagged behind.

We have another great people also, not enumerated in the census, but felt and needed in our civilization. I refer to the Jews, of whom we have a large number in Minnesota. For industry, integrity, sobriety, devotion to home and children, obedience to law and order, and genuine human fellowship, as well as in the domain of business and big enterprise, the Jews of my State have won the respect and affection of the men of all races with whom they live and work. The people of Minnesota are not selfish nor ungrateful, nor are they clannish or narrow in any sense of the words. Therefore I am sure that the people of Minnesota are not in sympathy with any purpose of denying to men and women in the old country who, as they and their fathers did, turn wistful eyes and hopeful faces toward our land the right to enter and make homes. They seek liberty and a fair chance. We do not own this country. It is God's country. We are only trustees, and trustees for the benefit of all the suffering men and women everywhere who love liberty and seek asylum. Let us not now prove that we are unworthy guardians of a great God-given trust. [Applause.]

Producers are always consumers also, and as the necessities of life are only produced by labor, adding to the number of toilers only lessens the burdens borne by each in producing the necessities for all the Nation. The whole trouble with conditions of labor lies in the distribution of the products of toil and the denial to him of a fair share in what he produces. Competition by other toilers is only a symptom, not the disease. That is all it amounts to. I do not hesitate to say that I am willing to place my views upon this question before any intelligent and untrammelled body of laboring men in the United

States. I do not dread the verdict on my attitude on this bill in the slightest degree. Let us not yield to misguided fear or selfishness in passing a law that would belittle our boasted claims to nobility as a nation and weigh us down with the sin of ingratitude and the curse of greed.

It would be ingratitude crying to heaven for vengeance if the great people who now occupy this arena of human endeavor should now, after having themselves come from lands of oppression across the sea, after having come with no more right than the humblest emigrant has to-day to come, having come and occupied this land and made good and enjoyed the bounties that nature offered and a just government afforded, it would be base ingratitude and a national ignominy to now selfishly shut the door in the face of the men whose only crime was to have been born under a flag that denied them an opportunity to educate themselves.

I can not make myself believe that this great Nation of ours will ever bring upon itself such ignominy and disgrace as that. I can not make myself believe that our President—no; I will not say that; I will let the issue fare as it will, if Congress is blind enough to pass this bill.

But I do say this: That President Wilson not only expressed the true doctrine of the Democratic Party and all its best traditions, as well as the true spirit of Americanism, which he as a great philosophic historian and statesman is so well qualified to express, but condemned in advance the literacy test when, in reply to a query as to his attitude toward emigration from southern Europe made during the last campaign, he wrote as follows:

The Democratic Party can not, without forgetting its very origin, advocate an illiberal policy in the matter of immigration. The party may almost be said to have originated in opposition to the alien and sedition laws, by which the Federal Party sought to all but shut the doors against naturalization, and at the same time silence the criticism of our own people against their Government. America has always been proud to open her gates to everyone who loved liberty and sought opportunity, and she will never seek any other course under the guidance of the Democratic Party. I am in hearty accord with the ancient faith and practice of the party that has honored me by nominating me for President.

And further on in the same letter—

Sound and honest men and women out of every one of the great European stocks, who come of their own volition and make permanent homes for themselves, are welcome amongst us. No one can justly criticize our laws, if only those who are sound and honest are admitted. Debased men and men of unserviceable kind may come out of any race or stock, but America has enriched her genius and made it various and universal, as she has renewed herself out of the ancient peoples from Norway to Italy and the rich lands of the Mediterranean, who have made the literature and history of the world.

Not one word as to shutting out "sound and honest men and women" simply because they can not read. Not one word in favor of making any sort of restriction on the number of "sound and honest men and women." Had President Wilson in this campaign document, which his party distributed all over the United States, declared in favor of this literacy test in this bill, he would not have been elected, as he should not have been.

I do not question the sincerity of President Wilson's utterance on this question during the campaign. He doubtless expressed well-matured thought on the matter, and what man in the country was better qualified as a profound student and historian to express the spirit of our Nation? As a historian he had pondered on our marvelous development and genius as a people. He could not fail to see how much was due to the immigrant. He knew that many of the deeds executed by the leading families of our country during pioneer days were signed by the mark and not the signature of the maker, because he was illiterate. He knew that the test in this bill would have excluded from this country the father of Abraham Lincoln had he come to our shores an immigrant, because he was illiterate. He knew, as he so aptly says, that "America has enriched her genius and renewed herself" out of the ancient peoples from Norway to Italy. And as a philosophic statesman, he knows now that it would be fatal to American genius for America to cease to be the asylum for the oppressed of the whole world, and to selfishly shut the door in the face of liberty-loving men and women. And as another great Democratic President, Grover Cleveland, well said 16 years ago in vetoing a similar bill:

It is said, however, that the quality of recent immigration is undesirable. The time is quite within recent memory when the same thing was said of immigrants who with their descendants are now numbered among our best citizens.

Had this law been in effect from 1899 to 1911, inclusive, it would have excluded, as shown by the reports of the Commissioner General of Immigration—

Dutch and Flemish	3,043
English	3,647
French	6,145
Irish	10,721
Russian	29,777

German	32,236
North Italian	38,897
Greek	55,089
Slovak	82,216
Hebrew	209,507
Polish	304,675
Total	775,953

as well as a much larger number of Croatians and South Italians against whom it is claimed to be directed.

Had these 775,953 immigrants been excluded this Nation would be just that much poorer to-day. Every sound man and woman of a country is, if honest, an asset. There is plenty of room for them on the millions of acres of untilled land from the countless resources undeveloped, the boundless opportunities awaiting. Let us not yield now to either misguided fear or weak selfishness in passing a law that would belittle our best claims to nobility as a Nation and weigh us down with the sin of ingratitude and the curse of greed. The oppressed of foreign lands, the poor—aye, even the ignorant of other lands—need us and our institutions. Judged by the past and measured by eternal equity, we need them. [Applause.]

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, the position of chairman of the Committee on Immigration is an unenviable one, and it adds a new terror if he must be made a personal target on the floor of the House. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] a little while ago exhibited some reasonable resentment when a Member on this floor taunted him by speaking of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] as the Republican chairman of the committee. For eight or nine years the gentleman from Alabama and I have sat side by side on these bills, and we have seen every device worked in and out of this House to prevent the question of immigration restriction from coming to a vote.

During that time, in spite of all its opponents could do, the question has come to a vote twice in the Senate and twice in the House.

When I had charge of the bill the gentleman from Alabama was practically Democratic chairman of the committee. He always acted as my right-hand man. Now that he has charge of the bill I try to reciprocate the kindness and assistance with which he backed me up when the Republican side of this House was in the majority.

But, as if it were not onerous enough for the gentleman from Alabama to be obliged to handle a bill which excites the prejudice and ill feeling of Members of this House, we find that his district must needs be made a subject of exasperating criticism. The gentleman who spoke a few minutes ago thought it necessary to hunt out the statistics of illiteracy of Mr. BURNETT's district, as if those figures had some bearing on the question before us. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that when a Member of Congress desires to render real service to his side of this question, rather than seek out the statistics of the district of the gentleman in control of the bill, he had better be on hand in committee when the vote is taken on the question of reporting the bill to the House. Mr. Chairman, I have great respect for the people of Minnesota, but they have never had a foe within their borders to lay waste the countryside, they have never seen the flower of their youth slain, and their fair domain was far outside the battle field. If the men of Minnesota had been through such an experience, I have no doubt that they would have borne themselves as well as did the men of Alabama, but afterwards they would have found it exceedingly difficult to educate their children.

#### THE IMMIGRATION BILL.

We are considering a bill 60 pages in length. It revises our entire immigration law, except in so far as the exclusion of Asiatics is concerned. This bill contains a clause known as the literacy test, devised for the purpose of reducing the amount of immigration into this country. Less than a single page deals with the literacy test, and yet the fate of this whole measure will depend on the attitude of Congress toward that single page. Eliminate that page and this bill would meet with universal approval in this House. The literacy test, if adopted, will reduce the volume of immigration. It is the only restrictive feature in the bill.

The policy of the American people for the greater part of our history has been to admit every able-bodied immigrant of good character. For a good many years, however, we have recognized the necessity of departing from that policy. Accordingly we have passed a succession of more or less inadequate laws designed to prevent the admission of laborers under contract and to hinder the introduction of immigrants who do not come here of their own initiative. Further than that we have never yet gone; but for many years past an effort has been afoot to secure legislation which will result in a substantial re-

duction in the volume of our immigration, even if we are obliged to exclude many desirable men and women.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARDNER. Certainly.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Is it not a fact that the Representatives from Massachusetts years ago argued in the House and in the Senate that the immigrants ought to be kept out of this country then, having reference to the German, Irish, Scandinavian, Norwegian, French, and others?

Mr. GARDNER. It may be so.

#### HISTORY OF THE LITERACY TEST.

The efforts of those who desire this reduction have, for the most part, been centered on the passage of a law which requires an immigrant at least to be able to read in his own tongue. Such a bill has four times passed the Senate and three times passed the House. Twice it has reached the President only to encounter a veto. President Cleveland vetoed the bill in 1897. The House passed it over his veto, but the Senate upheld the President. President Taft vetoed the bill in 1913. This time the Senate passed it over the veto, while the House upheld the President.

#### THE ISSUE.

We are now once more face to face with the great problem. Let us not attempt to begof the issue by a discussion of details. The real question is this: Has the time come when we ought to restrict immigration for the express purpose of reducing the number of immigrants, good, bad, or indifferent?

If you believe that the country needs and ought to receive every able-bodied man and woman of good character, you will have no hesitation in voting against this bill. If, on the other hand, you believe that we are admitting too many immigrants every year, I shall have no difficulty in persuading you to vote in favor of this bill, even though you may think that some plan for restriction better than the literacy test ought to be devised.

I do not think that I exaggerate when I say that four-fifths of the argument against restriction is addressed to emotion and prejudice. I wish I could say that the entire argument in favor of restriction is addressed to reason. Unfortunately, a goodly number of our allies have sharpened our opponents' weapons by exhibitions of racial antipathy and narrow-minded religious intolerance. I believe, however, that the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD would justify me in declaring that most of the debate against restriction is founded on sentimental arguments, while most of the debate in favor of restriction is founded on economic arguments.

#### COMMON GROUND.

In order to clear the ground of unnecessary encumbrances, I am willing to concede the truth of statements made on this floor to the effect that the foreigners who came to us between 1820 and 1870 have been successfully assimilated and that the immigration of that period has proved a blessing. I also concede that much of the immigration which comes to us to-day is likely to prove a blessing. I am also prepared to admit it as my belief that there is an annual shortage of labor on farms at certain seasons of the year and an occasional shortage of labor in other industries.

#### STATISTICAL.

Before embarking on my argument, I invite your attention to a few figures. It appears from the report of the Commissioner of Immigration that 1,427,227 aliens were admitted to this country in the year ending June 30, 1913, and 611,924 aliens departed from this country during the same period, leaving a net increase of over 800,000 in our population.

The report of the Commissioner of Immigration shows that of the aliens over 14 years of age admitted last year, 300,108, or about 24 per cent, were unable to read in any language. The ratio of illiteracy varied from 45 per cent, in the case of Lithuanians, down to less than 1 per cent in the case of English, Irish, Scotch, and Scandinavians.

So you see that this bill, if passed, will exclude 45 per cent of the Lithuanians, over 40 per cent of Sicilians, and less than 1 per cent of the English, Irish, Scotch, and Scandinavians.

The report of the Commissioner of Immigration also shows that from September 30, 1819, down to June 30, 1903, a period of nearly 84 years, 21,095,614 immigrants came to this country, whereas during the 10 years from June 30, 1903, to June 30, 1913, no less than 9,713,330 immigrants have arrived. Think of it! Nearly one-third of all the immigration of the last 100 years has arrived since June 30, 1903.

The Canadian and Mexican figures are necessarily very incomplete. The proposed literacy test would affect Mexicans to a very marked extent. It would scarcely touch immigrants from Canada.

## HISTORIC ARGUMENT.

So far as I understand it, the historic argument in favor of unlimited immigration is this: Time has proved that it was a wise policy to admit an unrestricted flow of immigration from foreign lands when this country was unsettled and when we had thousands of square miles of arable land to give away; therefore, it must still be a wise policy to admit an unrestricted flow now that the country is settled and no free available land remains.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Will the gentleman yield for a question there?

Mr. GARDNER. I will.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Was not it argued then that this foreign immigration, composed of various nationalities that now are said to have been good and desirable acquisitions to the State of the gentleman, were a menace to the peace and happiness of that Commonwealth?

Mr. GARDNER. Now, does the gentleman refer to the arguments of the Know Nothing Party in the fifties?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I have reference to the persistent argument made by Representatives of the State of the gentleman in the House and Senate against the influx of immigration that came in years ago which the gentleman inferentially said was good immigration and which was then claimed to be a menace to the peace of the country.

Mr. GARDNER. Has the gentleman finished?

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield for one brief question?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes.

Mr. HARDY. Do I understand the gentleman's position to be that the country has now come to a place in its history where we must shut the door of hope against the deserving strugglers of the Old World who want to seek our shores?

Mr. GARDNER. Why, certainly, we must shut the door of hope against some of them. That is the whole contention, as I have tried to point out. In case I have not made it clear, let me say so again. I believe that we must pass legislation which will cut down the volume of immigration, even if in cutting it down we are obliged to exclude some worthy, healthy, desirable men and women.

Mr. HARDY. I would like the gentleman to permit me to see if I understand him. The gentleman's position is that to worthy, deserving strugglers, any and all of them, we are ready to shut them out from our doors?

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman ought not to try to put words like those in my mouth. The gentleman knows perfectly well what I am aiming at. He can not make me say—

Mr. HARDY. If the gentleman declines—

Mr. GARDNER. If the gentleman pleases.

Mr. HARDY. Permit me to say in all frankness—I do not want to trespass on the gentleman or to misunderstand or misrepresent him.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. HARDY. Excuse me.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. The gentleman's position is, regardless of worth or lack of worth of the immigrant, immigration should be restricted. Is that right?

Mr. GARDNER. I think that the gentleman understands my position.

## THE DEMAND FOR LABOR.

How about these claims as to the necessity of vast supplies of labor to develop the Nation? To be sure, in times of prosperity we could give employment to hundreds of thousands more Europeans if we could only get them to work cheap enough.

If we were only willing to admit the Chinese, we could employ millions of them building railroads, factories, and all manner of good things. If some one could only import a race which would work for even less than the Chinese, every cent of capital and credit in the world would be commandeered for the promotion of enterprises on which they would be employed. The demand for their labor would be almost inexhaustible. But how about the rest of the workmen in the country? Where would they find their jobs? A few of them, of course, would become foremen and shopkeepers, but how about the vast majority?

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARDNER. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. SABATH. Is it not a fact that notwithstanding the great influx of immigration the wages of our laboring men are higher to-day—

Mr. GARDNER. I am coming to that.

Mr. SABATH. Wages are higher, are they not?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes; and they would be higher still had it not been for the immigrant.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman think they ought to be?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes.

Every year at certain seasons, when we hear of the demand for farm labor, gentlemen on this floor will pull long faces and solemnly express an opinion that a proper distribution of immigration would solve the problem. I venture to predict that until the employing farmer can offer a steady job to all whom he employs we shall never be free from this cry as to the shortage of farm labor. As to distribution, for eight years we have had a law intended to encourage it. South Carolina has tried it. She imported direct some 700 immigrants. All of them left her. Distribute men to your heart's content. They will not stay distributed. They will go where natural forces draw them.

If I were to tell my manufacturing friends in Massachusetts that competition does not lower prices, they would start to discourse on the incapacity of Members of Congress. Yet those very manufacturers will turn around and tell me that immigration has no effect on wages in the textile industries. Perhaps they may be right; but if so, labor is the only commodity in the wide, wide world whose price is not reduced by competition. To be sure, in flush times, the effect of immigration may only be to keep wages from rising as fast as they otherwise might. When two jobs are looking for one man, no amount of immigration will lower wages; but wait until two men are looking for one job and then see what happens.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Will the gentleman yield for just a minute?

Mr. GARDNER. Certainly.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Does not the gentleman recognize that there are many men at all times, no matter under what administration, out of employment and seeking work, and are not the labor unions keeping up the price of labor?

Mr. GARDNER. The labor unions can not keep up the price of labor unless existing conditions make it possible. Labor unions or no labor unions, when men are for a long time out of work they are bound to have a try at getting away with somebody else's job, even if they cut under the union scale in doing so.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes more to the gentleman.

## SUMMARY.

Mr. GARDNER. To sum it all up, Mr. Chairman, 1,400,000 people came into this country from abroad last year—1,400,000 men and women thrust in a single year into our labor market as present and future competitors.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. GARDNER. I can not yield.

To be sure, many of them were birds of passage, who competed with our people only for a season. Six hundred thousand aliens returned home, but 800,000 remained as a permanent addition to our population.

They are good men and women, I dare say, but they are used to a poor standard of living. They are willing to accept a poor standard of living. They are willing to go to work for less wages than our own people ought to work for. Do you think that American workmen can raise their standard of living while we are admitting each year over a million competitors to cut it down? If you know anything about workmen's problems, you must realize that it is hard for them to maintain their present standard of living. Of course it is hard. In the last 10 years we have admitted 10,000,000 people to help keep it down.

Some one has convinced many of our foreign-born voters that they want their cousins to come over here. All right; let the cousins come; but do our foreign-born voters want 1,400,000 cousins every year? Is not 700,000 a year quite enough for us to assimilate and educate up to our standard of living?

You, sir, sitting in the gallery listening to this debate, are earning \$12 per week. You would like to get \$14 per week. You think that you are worth it, do you not? How do you expect to get \$14 a week, if we admit 1,400,000 cousins a year who are willing to take your job at \$10 per week?

We legislators are not merciless; we have the deepest sympathy for the alien who has never had the chance to learn to read. We wish him well; nevertheless, we are not sent here to legislate for him but for our own people.

If an immigrant is afflicted with undeserved disease our pity goes out to him; but we think of our own people for whose health we are responsible and sadly we close the gates.

Likewise if an immigrant is poor and ignorant and desires to better his condition our pity goes out to him as well and to the extreme limit of safety we welcome him; but when the poor

and the ignorant come to us in such numbers that their poverty and their ignorance become a menace to the welfare of our own people, then we conceive it to be our duty to stem the tide. The hour has now arrived not to close the gates but to narrow the passage and control the flood.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MURRAY].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MURRAY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, it is always a difficult matter to disagree with one who may have attractive personal charms and an attractive way of presenting them, and of course it is especially painful to disagree with a Gardner from Massachusetts, like my colleague, who presents the old doctrine with up-to-date allusions, with up-to-date references, and present-day statistics.

Mr. Chairman, there has always been a Gardner in Massachusetts to raise this restriction-of-immigration cry. It is no new story to those of us who come from the Old Bay State. I have here the inaugural address of the governor of Massachusetts in 1855, when Henry J. Gardner was sworn in as governor of our State. He had campaigned through that Commonwealth on the very same doctrine of restriction and exclusion that our colleague to-day expounds. I cite to him and I cite to all of you that governor's address.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. GARDNER. That gentleman was elected governor, was he not? [Laughter.]

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. Yes; and I am going to tell my colleague about him in a few minutes. And it is most significant that one Gardner was elected governor of Massachusetts on this issue in 1854, while the present-day GARDNER was defeated last fall on this issue. [Applause.]

The gentleman from the sixth district of Massachusetts points to the fact that fourteen hundred thousand of somebody's cousins have come here in one year. Why, the extent and the kind of immigration in his day were the causes of complaint of Gov. Gardner in his inaugural address, because, on page 978 of the "Acts and Resolves" of 1855 the governor begins his discussion of the immigration problem by referring to the immigration to this country by 10-year periods. He points out the fact that from 1790 to 1800 the immigration was small; that from 1800 to 1810 it was small; that from 1810 to 1820 it was small; but he points to the fact, appalling to him, that from 1840 to 1850 it was 1,542,850. The reason for that high tide of immigration is clear to anybody who will stop to reflect upon conditions. I do not know just how much of that immigration was from Ireland, but I know that the largest part of it was from the Emerald Isle, because of the conditions in that famine-stricken country in that period from 1840 to 1847, when thousands of Irish mothers and Irish fathers fled to the Old Bay State, the refuge and the asylum that was held out to them from across the seas. [Applause.]

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT], the chairman of the committee, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] bewail the fact that to-day the Irish do not come. These gentlemen and others like them have a bitter complaint because the Germans are not crossing the seas. "If we could get the Irish," say they; "if we could get the Germans," say they, "there would be no desire to restrict; but the immigrants are coming from southern Europe; they are coming from darkest Russia; and this terrible horde must be kept out."

I defy any of them, no matter if he may have the ingenious skill of my colleague [Mr. GARDNER], no matter if he may have the adaptability to turn a point his own way possessed by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT], to present any new argument, to present any new cure, that was not discussed, seriously agitated, and written into law in that period in Massachusetts from 1855 to 1856. Do you know what they recommended? Let me remind you of the recommendations that those men made: They recommended an amendment to our Constitution prohibiting the exercise of the elective franchise to all of alien birth, qualified by naturalization, till they had resided in the United States 21 years.

They recommended that no person should be permitted to vote who could not read and write the English language.

Do you know that they disbanded military companies which had enrolled among its members persons of foreign birth? Do you know that they officially declared it was not safe, it was not wise, it was not statesmanlike, to have any such men in these militia companies?

Do you know that they made all sorts of attempts at restrictive legislation, and they made it an offense punishable by fine

for any clerk of court in Massachusetts to issue naturalization papers to any man of this alien class? "You do not mean it," say you. "They did not go as far as that!" Yes; they did; and God only knows how far they would have gone if it had not been for a single thing. My colleague [Mr. GARDNER] has referred to the terrible calamity of the Civil War. It was a terrible calamity, and we all know it. Soon after these days of 1855 and 1856 there came the call to arms, and it would be to you but the repetition of a familiar story to tell the history of the Irish and the Germans and other "despised aliens" in that war—men who were not wanted in times of peace, but who were most welcome recruits in time of war. [Applause.] Let me just give you some statistics on that line. A study carried on from official records of the nativity of 337,800 soldiers shows that 203,622 were born in the United States and 134,178 were foreign born. Of the 134,178 foreign-born soldiers, 19,985 were born in British America, 14,000 were of English birth, 12,000 were born in various countries other than those named, 36,000 were born in Germany, and 51,000 were born in Ireland. This makes it evident that 38 per cent, practically 2 out of every 5 soldiers of foreign birth, were Irishmen; and of the 2,800,000 enlistments in the United States service, 15.1 per cent, or 432,518, were natives of Ireland. [Applause.]

That is what turned the tide, not of bigotry—I will not style it that way. Those of us who have read this page of history always thought it was. Perhaps they had economic reasons. Gov. Gardner in 1855 said he was doing it all to protect the American workingman. Gov. Gardner in 1855 said he was doing it all to keep up wages of workingmen and that this kind of competition would lower the scale of American living. Gov. Gardner in 1855 said that the country had reached a point in development where it could not stand this influx of immigration. By the census of 1850 they had in the United States 23,000,000 people, and probably they had 25,000,000 people in 1855, when this agitation was on. To-day we have 100,000,000. They had 36 States and we have 48. They thought in 1855 that they had reached almost the limit of development; that the farm lands were gone; that manufacturers were reaching the limit of their production; that the mines could not yield much more from the bowels of the earth. Were they right? What say you? I do not believe you, Congressman GARDNER, are any more right to-day in your predictions as to the limit of production than Henry J. Gardner, the governor of Massachusetts, was right when he had statistics and arguments to prove his case in 1855. Your outcry is not directed against the Irish. They won their right in the Civil War. Yours is not directed against the Germans. But you say to-day, "Are these Irish to be compared with the scum of the earth that is coming from southern Europe?" I assert that the present-day immigration is not nearly so bad as men say it is, and I know it never could be as bad as some men said the Irish immigration was.

I know that the children of these foreigners make splendid pupils in our public schools; I know that the Italian-American and the Jewish-American elements in Boston and Massachusetts are distinctly valuable to the city and the State; and I am sure that the call to arms would find them loyal Americans, just as the Irish and the Germans proved to be. [Applause.]

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. Certainly.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman forgets that he is not giving the statistics of the number of square miles of unoccupied arable land in the United States.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. All right. Let us get at it in that way. There are less than 100,000 people in the State of Nevada, and the gentleman knows it.

A MEMBER. Forty thousand.

Mr. GARDNER. Is there any arable land for free distribution there?

Mr. KEATING. I should like to ask my colleague from Massachusetts if he has read the report of the agricultural commission appointed by the State of Massachusetts, which report was referred to in the morning papers?

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. I have not done any more than to see a reference to it in the morning papers.

Mr. KEATING. The statement was there made that these foreigners were taking up the abandoned farms of Massachusetts.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. The gentleman knows that these Italians from southern Europe are going on to the farms in Arlington, Medford, Malden, and Chelsea, right outside of Boston, wherever they can get them.

Mr. GARDNER. That is true to a certain extent.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. The sons of the Gardners are not occupying those farms. The Gardners and the rest of them abandoned those farms. [Laughter and applause.]

These poor Italians are getting out of the congested sections of the city, and you know it.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. GARDNER. Has not the gentleman forgotten the point that we wanted him to elucidate, and that was whether there were not hundreds and thousands of acres to be given away to immigrants at that time?

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. Let us go at it that way. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the discussion of the Alaskan railway bill. We are proposing to spend \$35,000,000 for that project. Can you tell the limits of development that will come as a result of that expenditure? I do not know what there may be to these plans and developments of that western country through irrigation and reclamation, but I am young. I have enthusiasm and optimism, and I do not think we have reached the limit of development, but if the gentleman will reflect perhaps he will reach the conclusion that we have not reached the limit of development. They referred a short time ago to the United Mine Workers; and I tell you frankly that I am afraid some young Irish-Americans believe in restriction; but I can not understand how any man familiar with the history of his people, of his State, like Massachusetts, can give his assent to anything that means a further restriction of immigration, for it is simply establishing the same argument against the downtrodden of other countries, the same charges that were made against the Irish along in 1850 and 1860.

I wish I had the time to refer at length to the things that are now being done in some of these countries.

I have obtained from the Department of the Interior, the Bureau of Education, an account of what has been accomplished in the last five years in the way of education of these persons affected by this legislation. This report shows that during the last 5 or 10 years measures for extending and improving the means of popular education have engaged the earnest efforts of the Governments of Italy and southern Europe during the past decade. Of course, the men and women who have grown up and who may now be trying to come here can not read and write. They can not comply with the provisions of this harsh literacy test, but the children of those men and women who are for the first time getting the opportunities that were denied to their fathers and mothers in a very short time will be able to comply with your education test, and I say it is a fallacious test, it is an un-American test, and an undemocratic test. It is a test that will not do the things in the way of restriction that you and your friends in favor of this bill claim it will do. You are trying to draw the inference that those of us who are opposed to the education test, the literacy test, so called, are in favor of letting down the bars and letting anybody come in. That is a trick of their debate, because these gentlemen know that there are already 20 causes for exclusion of men and women who may be seeking to come in through the immigration ports. Let me read to you some of the causes that are referred to in the immigration bulletin for November, which the gentleman from Alabama referred to in his remarks.

Idiots, imbeciles, and feeble-minded people are already excludable, and of course no one of us denies that that class of aliens should be excluded.

Mr. Chairman, persons afflicted with insanity and disease and those who are epileptics are excluded. Persons afflicted with tuberculosis, even though it be noncontagious, are excluded. Those who have loathsome or contagious diseases are excluded. Those who are professional beggars and paupers are now excludable. Those likely to become a public charge are excludable, and, mark you, whether or not you are likely to become a public charge is a matter of wide discretion. There was an administration of the Department of Labor when it was under the Department of Commerce and Labor, when the rules for defining who were likely to become a public charge were much less rigid than they are to-day. We have to-day a Democratic administration and a Democratic Secretary of Labor, our former colleague, a splendid official, but he has very strong ideas on this subject of restriction and of education. He is drawing the line pretty harshly as it is, and his definition of what constitutes one who is likely to become a public charge is much more rigid and strict than heretofore, and, in my humble judgment, much more rigid and strict than it ought to be. Those who are contract laborers are already excludable and those whom the surgeon has certified as having a defect, mental or physical, which may affect their ability to earn a living are excludable.

Some of the surgeons at some of the ports, particularly at the port of Boston, seem to be exclusionists, because on the slightest excuse they seem to issue a certificate that a man has some physical or mental defect that debars him from entering this country. Those who are accompanying aliens who are

excludable may themselves be excluded. Those who are under 16 years of age and unaccompanied by a parent, no matter what relatives may be here to meet them and greet them, are excludable and are excluded under the present rulings of the department. Those who are assisted aliens are excluded, and those who are cripples are excluded. Those who are polygamists and anarchists are and should be excluded, and those who are prostitutes and females coming for an immoral purpose are excluded, as they should be. Those who are supported by the proceeds of prostitution are and should be excluded. Aliens who procure or attempt to bring in prostitutes or females for any immoral purpose are excluded, and those who have come without passports. Those who are under the provisions of the Chinese exclusion act are excluded. And to that list, Mr. Chairman, it is proposed to add another class. We deny the need of this legislation, and we hope that it will not be enacted into law. [Applause.]

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend, curtail, and considerably alter my remarks in the Record. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to extend and alter his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER].

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I am sure there is no Member of this House who would not heartily join with the committee in its endeavor to properly strengthen our present immigration laws, but on what lines ought the laws to be strengthened? We have just heard the long list of persons who are excluded under our present law. It is possible, I judge, to strengthen our present laws along these lines. It is possible to strengthen the laws so that the undesirable classes shall be kept out of this country. It is possible to strengthen the laws so that the criminal shall more carefully be excluded. It is possible, I judge, to strengthen the laws so that the physically degenerate, defective, and morally degenerate shall be excluded. It is possible to add to and strengthen all our existing laws on rational lines, and I am very sure that all gentlemen here would be glad to add their voices to secure such results, but we should not disguise the fact that this bill is not designed primarily for that purpose. Provisions we all approve are contained in this bill. Indeed, there are many who would gladly support the bill with only one exception. That exception is the provision for a literacy test. To that we are opposed. With that provision in the bill we must withhold our support, for we consider it wholly un-American and indefensible.

It is the belief of those who oppose the imposition of the literacy test that it is impracticable; that in operation it would be impossible of just and fair administration. Such was the belief of ex-Secretary Nagel, who, after a careful investigation as head of the department charged with the duty of the administration, reported that it would add over \$1,000,000 annually to the cost of administration and that it would be impossible to fairly and justly impose it as a test.

It would seem that a careful consideration of the provision by anyone must lead to the same conclusion. Imagine a shipload of over 1,000 immigrants coming in after a long voyage, in most cases their first experience at sea. Think of these poor, frightened, seasick foreigners, landed in a strange land thousands of miles away from the familiar and the accustomed, being hurriedly lined up for an examination touching their qualifications to read and understand a language. Before strangers, with the fear of deportation before them—which in many instances will seem to them worse than a sentence of death—what will they see or understand of the "slips of uniform size" which carry the test? If merely nervous apprehension causes a large percentage of "flunking" even among college applicants for graduation, what may be expected of these unfortunate men and women whose whole future depends on their meeting the test? It is unfair, unjust, and cruel. In practical application it will be, it must be, either a farce or a tragedy.

And from the other side it is equally bad. The power to determine the tremendous issue of admission or exclusion is lodged with an immigrant inspector without possible oversight or curb against favoritism, incompetence, or prejudice. If the inspector desires, he can arbitrarily find that the immigrant can not meet the test. If he is not satisfied with the pronunciation, the infection, or the emphasis of the applicant, he can exclude. There is no time for protest. There is no right of appeal. At the mere whim of an inspector who may be dissatisfied with the appearance or manner of an applicant he may be deported, and there is no possible remedy. This is so mani-

festly un-American that I can not believe gentlemen who favor this legislation can have carefully considered it. The provision is an invitation to injustice. It is an encouragement to the exercise of oppressive and arbitrary power. There is not placed such an awful responsibility and power in the hands of an underpaid and untrained employee by any other civilized government of the world.

It must be evident that the imposition of the literacy test means putting into the hands of the administration, whatever it may be, the power to carry out its purpose, whatever that may be. Inevitably that will tend to favoritism and make the Immigration Bureau a political machine. The test will mean whatever those charged with the administration of the bureau shall choose to make it mean. It is well known that in execution the literacy tests relating to the right of franchise operate as an instrument to preserve the power of the dominant party. There is no pretense of impartial administration. It is a dangerous power to intrust to anybody, and it will tend inevitably to corrupt and debase the service.

#### CLASSES OF IMMIGRANTS.

It is urged that the class of immigrants we are now receiving is different from and more dangerous than those which have preceded them. That objection has been urged at every period of our country's history; it was urged as strongly in the years gone by against the Irish, the German, and the Scandinavian as it is now urged against the Italian, the Austrian, and the Jew. It is remarkable how persistent is the antiforeign prejudice.

Now, it is true, immigration is not so strong from those countries which are giving their people good government and prosperity; their people are not compelled to leave their fatherland to secure liberty and a chance in life. It is likewise true that our immigration now is strongest from those countries where governments are most oppressive and opportunities fewest—those who come to seek a land where liberty is found and a chance to rise may be secured; to such, whose love of freedom and energy of character have led them to our shores, we can well afford a welcome.

It has been shown that the illiterate immigrant is in most cases from the peasant class; he is from the country. The city immigrant can always read. Will it be to our advantage to exclude the countryman, even though he can not read, and take the city bred? Will it be better that the steamship companies shall "induce" their steerage passengers from the city slums rather than from the country districts? The country born and bred may be ignorant, but he is rarely vicious. The dangerous, the undesirable, the unassimilable are from the cities.

Illiteracy is not a fault. In most cases it is a misfortune. Because men and women leave a country where they could not have the privilege of learning to read and come to a land where they may thus learn ought to be a reason for welcoming them rather than excluding them.

#### AN UNREASONABLE TEST.

Somebody suggested to the chairman of the committee the substitution of the military for the literacy test. "No," said the chairman, "that would keep out many of the very best people." And yet in the same connection he says, "I know that all over this country there are hundreds and thousands of good men and good women that are illiterate." He can see that the military test would keep out many of the best people, and yet he will not admit that the literacy test will keep out "good men and good women." One test would be as justifiable as the other. Neither would determine capability or moral character or the necessary qualifications for good citizenship.

#### HOW IMMIGRATION AFFECTS LABOR.

It is stated that the labor organizations favor restriction because immigration tends to reduce the wages of American workmen. The exact opposite is true. Immigrant workmen come to obtain the work which is refused by American workmen. The immigrant takes the "dirty job" the first year. He digs ditches, he cleans streets, he uses the pick and shovel. The next year he takes a better job at higher wages, leaving his old place vacant to the incoming immigrant. That has been the practical operation of the present system for years. During recent years, except for other reasons, there has never been an excess in the labor field into which the immigrant enters on his arrival. To-day enterprises where large amounts of labor are demanded await the securing of laborers. To-day tens of thousands of farm hands are demanded in the West to carry on the necessary farming operations. One cause of the scarcity of farm products is the scarcity of farm labor. The high cost of living is in part attributable to the dearth of laborers on the farms. To-day tens of thousands of homes and good wages could be found for domestic help if it could be secured.

Those laborers who fear their jobs will be endangered or their wages reduced by immigration should remember that when immigration is largest wages are highest. During the last two decades immigration has been greater than ever before, and yet during that period the hours of labor have been reduced and the wages increased more than ever before.

In the boot and shoe industry the hours of labor have decreased 6.4 per cent and the wages have increased 34.8 per cent. In hosiery and knit goods hours of labor decreased 7.9 per cent; wages increased 36 per cent. Woolen and worsted, hours decreased 6.3 per cent; wages increased 49.7 per cent. Cotton goods, hours decreased 8.1 per cent; wages increased 61 per cent.

#### DANGERS OF IMMIGRATION IMAGINARY.

It was supposed the foreigner stimulated and encouraged crime. Statistics disprove that. In New York State, which has the largest foreign population, the native born were 61.7 per cent, and the foreign born were 38.3 per cent; but of those in prison 68 per cent were native born and only 32 per cent were foreign born.

It was supposed the foreigners not only added to our store of ignorance, but despised knowledge and would not seek to learn. So far from this being true, Commissioner of Education Claxton has just officially reported that from statistics collected from his bureau it is shown that—

The least illiterate of our population are the native-born children of foreign parents:

Illiteracy—

He says—

among the children of native-born parents is three times as great as that among native-born children of foreign parents.

It was supposed that immigration degraded and diminished the wages of labor. It has been shown that hours of labor have been most shortened, the conditions of labor most improved, and the wages of labor most increased during those years and periods when immigration was strongest.

#### OUR PRESENT LAWS.

Our present laws, the outgrowth of a century's experience, are designed to exclude all those who constitute the undesirable classes. We are a sparsely settled country with only 30 people to the square mile, while Europe has over 300. Yet we have already the strictest immigration laws among the nations. No other nation guards so closely its gates. Many nations are using every endeavor to encourage immigration. We can afford to be careful. We are justified in being particular, for we may to a large extent select and choose; but we can not afford to be unjust; we can not afford to build a Chinese wall about our country; we can not afford to become a hermit nation.

It can not be that a proposition which in administration is impossible, which in economics is unwise, which in morals is unjust, can be defensible as legislation. That which is inherently wrong can not be politically justified.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, we have listened during the last few minutes to the views of two of the able Representatives of the State of Massachusetts—Mr. GARDNER for this bill and Mr. MURRAY against the bill. Mr. MURRAY read to us the views of a Massachusetts governor made as far back as 1855. Let us go back still further and look a moment at a most remarkable statement made on the floor of Congress in March, 1794, almost 120 years ago to a day, by a Representative from Massachusetts, Mr. Sedgwick. That patriot declared in the Halls of Congress that although the United States was founded as an asylum for the oppressed for all the world, it could not forever be so. He said:

We must not invite or bribe the undesirable to come with us. America must husband its wealth of land, for many will be dependent when it is gone.

Think of the prophetic warning of that patriot. And in the next year, in December, 1795, he even went so far as to predict that public lands would be gone in 100 years, and that when the oppressed arrived on our shores they would not be quickly relieved, but would be overcome by their miseries before they had learned to love the flag of the United States.

My friends, that prophecy, in my opinion, has come true. Sedgwick, of Massachusetts, 120 years ago never dreamed of the extent the United States would be in territory, but he did foresee that as our country filled up the older countries of the other hemisphere would fill up faster, and that the overflow would become less desirable in every decade and must become still more undesirable as every 10-year period rolls by.

This is exactly what has happened since it ceased to be possible for an immigrant to go straight through the gates at New York to free acres in the West—straight through, with a ticket

pinned to his shoulder and a smile of happy expectancy in his face. Those days are gone. He jams into the cities. He falls into the hands of bosses, padrones, or agents. His labor is farmed out. He does not get a good chance, and the people of his own race now in this country know it. This is said in all fairness, and not against any one race or people.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is evident to every man here that the time is here when the United States shall declare that it can no further be an asylum for the oppressed of all the world. The exact form that the restriction bill shall take is not so important as that the step be taken—anything that will restrict.

Now, Jefferson said:

Spare no expense in obtaining immigrants.

But in Jefferson's time, my friends, we had a country to give away. And we have given it away. We have lived up the heritage of our children. We have raced through our public lands at breakneck speed. When we hear the statement that the West is full of arable public lands—and I admit there are some lands in the public domain—in Nevada, for instance, and other States of that character—that are tillable, the acreage good for farming is not so much as the figures indicate. Further, it is apparent to every man who stops to think that, with our modern machinery methods and costs, these very immigrants who are coming in such numbers can not get to the land.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I will be glad to do so.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman lives in a very large State and has a very large district territorially. Is there any land unoccupied in the district he represents?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. There is no public land—that is, practically no public land outside of the great reserves being held for posterity. There are vast areas of logged-off land in our State. We have tried to populate these by giving them to the immigrants at the lowest possible and most favorable terms. But we can not keep this newest kind of immigration on the land. We have tried that.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. SABATH. Can the gentleman state about what the population is per square mile in this country?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. No; I can not. I can not yield further.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield further.

Mr. SABATH. Would he be surprised if I said it is only 30 per square mile?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. That makes no difference. I will reply to that by saying that 48 per cent—practically one-half—of our foreign-born people in the United States, including those who came here under the circumstances described by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MURRAY] and fought in the Civil War, live in the four States of Illinois, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, and New York, and they can not get to those vast acres.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman is wrong in his figures.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes; I yield.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Can the gentleman tell the committee what percentage of the country is now under cultivation?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I can not tell. I will say this: That a few years ago, when signs of distress began to appear in the larger States and crowded cities, we undertook at once to conserve the resources of the United States. We put aside our coal lands, our forests, and other natural resources, and after we did that it was our duty to shut the front door. It admits of no argument. If we are to save what is left of our country, our public domain, let it be for the posterity of the people now in the United States, foreign born or otherwise. The time has now come, in my opinion, to put up the bars.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I can not yield further. I have but a few minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. In the discussion over the allotment of time this morning, my colleague on the committee from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] said that this was a three-cornered proposition. I want to agree with that, but the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, Mr. HAY, answered the gentleman from Pennsylvania by saying that it had come down to a proposition where we must vote "yes" or "no." Therefore I take my stand with those who will vote for this bill, for while I had hoped and worked as hard as I could in the committee to substitute some method which I was positive would be more certain than this very light literacy test will be, I shall support this bill on account of the

clause in it that I am about to read, if for no other cause. It is on page 38 and is numbered section 19. I read:

That any alien, at any time within five years after entry, who shall enter the United States in violation of law; any alien who within five years after entry shall be found advocating or teaching the unlawful destruction of property, or advocating or teaching anarchy, or the overthrow by force or violence of organized government, or the assassination of public officials \* \* \* shall, upon the warrant of the Secretary of Labor, be taken into custody and deported.

My friends, in my opinion that clause makes the bill well worth while. Personally, I am for a rigid restriction of immigration, not necessarily undesirable. It is time to put up the bars. My personal opinion is that a 40-word test, which is to be read and not written down, will not be sufficient; will not keep out the numbers that we hope it will. I have filed in a separate report my views as to the necessity for the words "and writing" in this literacy test.

I urge consideration of the deportation clause. In my opinion the troubles in the United States in the last few years have been caused by those who have arrived lately, just as Sedgwick, of Massachusetts, prophesied 120 years ago they would come; who, before they can by any circumstances be taken into the full breadth and freedom and meaning of our institutions in the United States, have turned against us and gone out on the soap boxes and preached the overthrow and destruction of this Government.

My friends, the time has come to put up the bars. [Applause.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, how much time has the gentleman consumed?

The CHAIRMAN. He has consumed nine minutes. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] is recognized.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I have no one here just now who desires to speak—no member of the committee. I will yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES]. I expected to yield to members of the committee, but I do not see the Members here who asked for time.

Mr. DIES. Can not the gentleman give me 15 minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. How much time does the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURNETT. I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] is recognized for 15 minutes.

[Mr. DIES addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, how much time has the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] consumed?

The CHAIRMAN. Seventeen minutes.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LINDBERGH].

Mr. LINDBERGH. Mr. Chairman, the whole discussion on this bill, so far, has centered on the literacy provision. If that constituted the whole bill, I would be opposed to it, for I do not think the literacy test provided by the bill is sufficient to insure the securing of good immigrants nor to exclude the bad ones. I know of some old residents in my State who can not read and still are more intelligent and far better citizens than many of the people who can. Furthermore, it would be impossible to secure better citizens than the people to whom I refer as not being able to read. That does not argue in favor of illiteracy, however, for these same persons would, so far as they are themselves concerned, be much more satisfied if they were able to read, but they could not be better citizens than they have been.

I wish to compliment my colleague [Mr. MANAHAN] on his splendid argument. His statements on the conditions in regard to literacy in Minnesota are true. There is a very small per cent of illiteracy in Minnesota, and his encomium upon the foreign-born citizens of Minnesota is truly deserved by them. But that argument does not tell against the bill, for the percentage of literacy that he describes as existing in the State shows that even if this bill had been in operation from the beginning those same people would have been eligible, with but few exceptions. I have been in the State since I was a year old, and have studied the conditions and know that to be true. That notwithstanding, I think the literacy test should be amended so that it would not keep out desirable immigrants from countries where persecution takes place, as against the Pole, as long as immigration is permitted into the country.

The literacy test is so simple in the bill that almost any intelligent person could in a very brief period fit himself or herself to pass the test if not already prepared. Those who have naturalized parents or certain relatives here are provided for, and those who have relatives here who are not naturalized are in most cases able to help their relatives whom they seek to have come to prepare and qualify. As I have already said, I am not satisfied with the literacy test, but there are so many provisions in the bill that will operate well that I shall vote

for the bill even if the amendment to make a more satisfactory literacy test fails.

There are many Poles in some sections of Minnesota. I am personally acquainted with many of them and have done business with them. Of those whom I am acquainted with, all could read and write before they came to America, but there are many Poles who have come from Russia proper, where they are prevented by the Government from obtaining an education. These, so far as I have been able to learn, make first-rate citizens. They appreciate the advantages that are offered in this country over their terrible usage in Russia, and they accommodate themselves rapidly to our country, and help in the best way to develop and improve it, along with themselves. Their children are healthy and exceptionally intelligent and quick to learn. I could not state the facts better than they are stated in a letter that I have received in answer to an inquiry that I made myself of a prominent business man residing in my home town, Little Falls. I therefore send the letter to the desk to be read by the Clerk in my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

LITTLE FALLS, MINN., January 24, 1914.

Hon. C. A. LINDBERGH,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In answer to your favor of the 9th instant, will say that I should have answered sooner, but I am somewhat under the weather, and it takes all my ambition to keep on my feet, so, under the circumstances, I will answer the best I can.

I think your idea of amending the bill is a good one, not that I wish to be partial, but the circumstances surrounding the Poles are entirely different than any other people that I know of.

The Poles are not a barbarous people, as most of our enemies would have you believe. They left barbarism when they became a Christian nation, about 965, and from then until her partition in 1795 her mission was the protection of European civilization and Christianity from the invasion of Asiatic hordes.

Poles love liberty; their kings were elective and they had some form of a constitution as far back as the thirteenth century, while the rest of Europe suffered under the whip of despotism.

The Poles are sympathetic and love justice. In the thirteenth century the Jews were horribly persecuted by the Christians of France, England, Spain, and Germany. The Poles, disgusted with the shameful treatment given the Jews, issued a proclamation to the Jews all over Europe, offering to divide with them bread and home, and the number of Jews still residing in old Poland is proof that they took advantage of the offer. In the Polish insurrection of 1831 the inscription on their banners read, "For you and for us," meaning that they were fighting for the oppressed Russians as well as for the oppressed Poles. Thus the Poles, bent under the whip and oppression of the three tyrants, still extended a helping hand to their brothers in suffering, although strangers in dialect and in religion. In 1791 Poland adopted a new constitution, abolishing serfdom of every description and putting man and man on equal footing. In Prussia serfdom was abolished in 1848 after Gen. Miroslawski's insurrection. In Austria-Hungary and Russia after 1861, and that not until Poland shed rivers of blood and filled Russia's prisons to their fullest capacity. To these three tyrants Poland must look for her education and her support.

The Poles are a highly cultured people. In the fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth century the Poles were among the highest cultured people in the world. She has produced many learned men and women, among them the celebrated Nicholas Kopernik, born the 19th of February, 1473, at Terun (now Thorn), educated in Jagelle University at Krakow, and whom the Germans are trying to take from us. George Washington admitted that the arrangements of his successful defenses were greatly due to the engineering genius of his aid-de-camp, the Polish officer, Thad Kosciusko. Even to-day, midst poverty and oppressions, we try to keep abreast of other people. Look at the list of singers, musicians, and composers. Look at the list of painters, actors, writers, and scientists, of whom Madame Curie Sklodowska, the inventor of radium, is a good example. Even on the field of sport we have a fair representation.

Russia, Prussia, and Austria want to exterminate the Poles at any cost, but they do not want them to emigrate as they want them to swell their armies. But they do want to keep the Poles in the utmost poverty and ignorance. The censorship is so strict that the world knows little or nothing of how they treat the Poles. The Russian motto is, "Don't give them bread or school, but give them plenty of vodka (whisky)," as the Government owns practically all the distilleries.

Joseph Elson, of St. Paul, Minn., traveling salesman for Kling Bros. & Co., of Chicago, Ill., says, "I will take oath on a stack of Bibles that the school I attended at Suwalk, Suwalka, Gubernia, Russian Poland, there were between four and five hundred of us children assembled in one room under the most insanitary conditions. Sometimes there were two teachers, but most of the time only one." The Poles had many private schools hidden away in basements, attics, or private homes, kept up by private subscription; but the Government sought them out and showed them no mercy—to prison they went as political offenders.

There are now between four and five million Poles in the United States, of which a large percentage can neither read nor write—that is, of the older people—yet the United States Government has little or no trouble with them. Look at the poor list in any city or locality and you will find that the Poles are in the minority. Go through the asylums or prisons and there you will find that only a small percentage of its inmates are Poles. Still the American press accuses the Poles of a good many crimes that some other people commit. On September 23, 1913, at Benton, Ill., some miners killed a couple of rowdies in a free-for-all fight at a wedding. The news went broadcast in great big headlines, "A race riot between American and Polish miners." Three men were arrested on suspicion, whether guilty or not, but neither of the men was a Pole. (Investigation by the Polish National Alliance.)

At the present time a bitter war is being fought between some Polish factions and the Catholic clergy; still no blood is shed nor riots adhered to, and most people, with the exception of those directly interested, know little or nothing about it. Still we look for a speedy settlement of those differences to the entire satisfaction of all concerned.

I understand the committee reporting on the bill claimed that the Poles were adverse to the public schools. Among the speakers on the

high-school proposition last year were two Poles, Val E. Kasperek (the other name I rather not mention). Both were in favor of the school, with no Polish voice against it.

The Poles are leaving the cities and settling on farms. (Urged on by the Polish press and clergy.) You can not help but admit that they know how to make the soil produce the dollars and cents, and it takes only a short time to transform a barren country into an earthly paradise. W. R. Mackenzie, secretary of the Northern Minnesota Development Association, said to me the other day, "They ought to admit the Poles. They are the best farmers we have. They invariably succeed where other people fail. But get them on the farm."

According to statistics, only 26 per cent of the tillable soil of this country is farmed to-day; 74 per cent still lays idle, waiting for some willing hand to turn its product into dollars and cents for the benefit of the country and the human race. Millions of dollars are spent annually advertising farm lands. We want the immigrant. We want the settlers. Then why not give the Poles a chance, whether literate or illiterate? We know they make good American citizens. It is no experiment. Canada and the South American countries admit them under all conditions, but we love the land of the Stars and Stripes. With her we wish to cast our lot. For her we wish to live and die.

I have written a long letter, and I hope it won't bore you too much, and if you can possibly help us in this matter I assure you it will be greatly appreciated by the Poles of both continents.

Thanking you in advance and wishing you health and good fortune, I am,

Your friend,

A. F. KOSLOSKY.

Mr. LINDBERGH. This letter shows for itself the quality of man who wrote it, and as all the facts are verified by history, current literature, and conditions that many of the Members know, it proves its own way. As this man, Mr. Koslosky, writes, there is no special reason why these people should, when otherwise qualified, be excluded because they can not read. They are persecuted in Russia. I am not sure that this persecution is not now provided for in one section of the bill so that they may be admitted, but it could easily be provided for a certainty.

The language of the literacy test does not seem severe. I should fear that it might not be administered in good faith at all times and that sometimes discriminations might be made against immigrants who were qualified. Of course, it is impossible to get a bill covering so large a field as this one to suit all conditions.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KONOP].

Mr. KONOP. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this bill. There are some good provisions in it, and I regret that I can not vote for it. The provision on page 7 of the bill which excludes all aliens over 16 years of age who can not read is so silly and unreasonable, so unjust, so repugnant to American traditions, that I can not support it. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of keeping out the criminal, the insane, and mentally defective; the diseased and morally unfit; the pauper and those incapable of earning a living; but I can not be so blind, so unjust, so un-American, as to vote for a provision that will keep out of this country a good, healthy, moral, and upright man for the simple reason he can not read some language.

The literacy test is no test at all. Never anywhere except here have I heard it argued that inability to read is a badge or a sign of bad character or bad morals. Just because a man can not read does not mean that he is a bad man. Illiteracy is no crime, nor is it a badge of crime. It is a misfortune; and any law that places a penalty on a person that has been so unfortunate as to be in such surroundings where that person could not obtain an education is unjust and wrong.

Illiteracy is not ignorance. A person who has been denied an opportunity to learn to read is not necessarily ignorant. Illiteracy is a misfortune, and a law that places a penalty on a person that has been denied an opportunity to obtain an education is unjust, discriminatory, and un-American.

For over a century our country has been heralded as the asylum for the oppressed of every land. For over a century we have maintained an open-door policy. Immigrants have been coming to our shores singing the hymns of their native lands, and to-day they and their posterity are singing "My Country, 'Tis of Thee." These men who came have builded homes; they have cleared away the forests; they have plowed up our prairie; they have made our cities vast hives of industry; and when the very existence of our country was at stake our foreign-born population loyally responded to the call to save the Union. Thousands of them gave up their lives that this Nation might live. No literacy test was applied to them. When they responded to the call of duty no one tested them as to whether or not they could read.

Mr. Chairman, the proposition to prescribe the literacy test to the immigrant to-day is nothing short of an insult to the immigrant of old. We all know these pilgrims of old. We all know these sturdy pioneers who have made our Nation so great. To vote for this bill, Mr. Speaker, I would deny my mother who has borne me, I would insult my father who has struggled so hard to rear me, I would insult the fathers and mothers who have made Wisconsin, my home, so grand.

Under the open-door policy we have prospered and grown. We have advanced in science, industry, and education. An analysis of the progress and advancement in different sections of our country will show that advancement has been greatest where the immigrant has settled. Are we to stop now? Are we to now turn back on the policy that has enabled us to grow, advance, and prosper?

Mr. Chairman, why such haste to do such injustice? Why such anxiety to overthrow a policy that has been so beneficial to us? Who wants this bill, and what are the arguments presented for its passage?

It is claimed that the laboring men of this country want this bill. It has also been claimed that the farmers want it. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that the great mass of laboring men and farmers want this bill. Who are the laboring men and farmers of this country? They are all of foreign stock. By far the largest number of them are sons of immigrants, and many of them are immigrants themselves. Are they so unjust that they would now deny their kinsfolk to come and dwell among them? Mr. Chairman, I can not believe it.

It is argued that the immigrant competes with American labor and causes the lowering of wages and lowers the American standard of living. I believe that this is an assertion without proof. In spite of a steady immigration wages have increased, and the American standard of living has not been lowered, but, I believe, is higher to-day than it has ever been. It is a well-known fact that the present-day immigrant becomes the unskilled laborer. The native American and the earlier immigrant are the skilled workers. It is true that the unskilled labor is cheaper than skilled labor, and hence the standard of living among the immigrants is lower than that of the skilled workers. Such a condition will always exist. Such a condition is a part of an industrial system. We have unskilled work to do. The native American will not perform unskilled labor, and we need the immigrant to advance us in industry. Since the immigrant takes up the unskilled work he does not compete with the native American skilled laborer.

It is sometimes claimed that the immigrant is detrimental to the organization of labor. The statistics of the Immigration Commission show, however, that unions are as strong among foreign born as among native Americans. The following two tables show percentages of different classes of labor organized. These two tables are taken from Senate Document No. 696, Sixty-second Congress, second session; and I want to also quote a brief statement in that document relative to this matter:

The ratio of organized workers to all male wage earners in each population group is shown in Table XIV.

TABLE XIV.—Organization of native and immigrant labor.<sup>1</sup>

Nativity of wage earners.	Percentage organized.
Native-born of native father:	
White.....	13.9
Negro.....	17.9
Native-born of foreign father.....	14.1
Foreign-born.....	13.4

<sup>1</sup> Immigrants in Manufacturing and Mining, p. 141.

Neither could a line be drawn in respect of unionism between the "desirable immigrants" from northern and western Europe and the "undesirable aliens" from southern and eastern Europe.

TABLE XV.—Organization of immigrant labor.

	Total number.	Organized.	
		Number.	Percent.
"Desirable" races:			
French Canadian.....	573	133	23.2
English.....	524	87	16.6
Irish.....	724	107	14.8
Swedish.....	515	48	9.3
Bohemian and Moravian.....	537	26	4.8
German.....	1,101	51	4.6
Total.....	3,974	452	11.4
"Undesirable" races:			
North Italian.....	881	351	39.8
Lithuanian.....	1,408	497	35.3
Hebrew.....	761	163	21.4
Ruthenian.....	684	144	21.1
Slovak.....	1,706	224	13.7
South Italian.....	2,428	258	10.5
Magyar.....	1,501	146	9.7
Polish.....	3,280	313	9.5
Total.....	12,649	2,106	16.6

On the whole, the average percentage of union men among the "undesirable aliens" is higher than among the immigrants of the preferred races. The percentage of trade-unionists among North Italians is nearly three times as high as among native Americans of native parentage; the Lithuanians furnish twice as many as the more desirable Englishmen; the Hebrews twice as many as the Swedes; the Lithuanians are far ahead of the Americans of native stock; even the South Italians can boast a percentage twice as high as the Germans; the Magyars and the Slovaks (popularly known as "Huns") march in front of the Swedes; and the Poles, who are at the tail end of the procession of undesirables from eastern Europe, still outnumber two to one their more favored kinsmen, the Bohemians and Moravians. Considering that the native Americans and the members of the races which contributed most largely to the earlier immigration are, as a rule, engaged in higher occupations, where they are for the most part segregated from the recent immigrants, it is clear that the latter could not be an obstacle in the way of organization among the skilled men; and that they have not been an obstacle is shown by the fact that the recent immigrants themselves furnish a higher percentage of organized workmen. Regardless of the opinions of the Immigration Commission, one thing seems to be well established by its statistics, viz, that there is no casual connection between immigration and the slow progress of organization among the industrial workers of the country.

Another argument presented here in favor of the application of the reading test is that there is too much immigration and it should be restricted. Mr. Speaker, this is an assertion without any proof. In spite of this cry of too much immigration, the ratio between foreign born and native born in the last half of a century is practically the same. Who will claim that there was too much immigration from 1850 to 1860 or from 1860 to 1870? And yet census statistics show that the percentage of foreign born and native born has not changed. The following table is taken from page 788, volume 1, on Population, Census 1910:

Country of birth.	Per cent distribution of total population of United States.						
	1910	1900	1890	1880	1870	1860	1850
Native.....	85.3	86.4	85.3	86.7	85.6	86.8	90.3
Total foreign born.....	14.7	13.6	14.7	13.3	14.4	13.2	9.7
Total population.....	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

It is also argued that the present-day immigrant comes from a source out of harmony with the spirit of American institutions, and hence not readily assimilable on that account. The same argument was used against the old immigrants, who are now so lauded as being better than the present-day immigrant. The same narrow argument was used by those who opposed immigration in the first half of the nineteenth century. And now we find those who were so condemned then lauded to the skies. But, Mr. Speaker, do they who say that the present-day immigrant is not readily assimilable mean to argue that those immigrants who belong to these unassimilable races, who can read a page or two in their own language, will, because of that test, become readily assimilable? Such a test will not keep out the undesirable ones. Let me quote to you from the New York Tribune of May 9, 1912, on this question of assimilability:

Would any real advantage come to the country from the enactment of the Dillingham immigration bills? One familiar argument for it is that the United States is receiving immigrants now who are not readily assimilable. But it is not illiteracy that makes the immigrant from parts of southern and eastern Europe unassimilable. If he can not be assimilated, it is because his racial likeness to the settlers of this continent is too great. But the literacy test will keep out only a fraction of the alien races. The problem of their assimilation will remain unsolved.

Nor will the literacy test be sure to keep out the least desirable of the arriving immigrants. It is not usually the man who can not read and write who recruits an anarchist population here. It is the "Intellectual proletariat" of Europe which, coming here, congregates in cities and adds to their ferment. The man who works with his hands has always found his place readily in this country, and if he ever makes trouble, by strikes and rioting, it is only as he begins to be assimilated and to develop the American standard of living. Again, the criminals who come to this country and are one of the gravest evils of immigration are seldom of the illiterate class. Illiterates do not write Black Hand letters.

But is it true that the immigrants of to-day can not be assimilated? Whence comes these immigrants who are so different than we? Are we really not of their blood? The Italian immigrant is the one especially attacked. Mr. Speaker, a people who have builded the greatest empire of antiquity; a people whose civilization lighted the whole known world and who discovered the new; a people to whom we go for the best in literature, in art, and in government. Such people ought to be welcomed to our shores. Will anyone claim that a race that has produced a Boccaccio, a Dante, a Michaelangelo, a Columbus, a Cabot, and a Caruso can not be assimilated?

Another people against whom a stigma is cast, and against whom this bill is aimed, are the Polish people. If this bill becomes a law, over 35 per cent of these people will be rejected. The Polish people are the most unfortunate people of Europe.

They are to-day a people without a country, a race without a home. The story of their struggle for liberty touches the heart of liberty-loving people everywhere. They have been robbed of their country. Educational facilities are being denied them, and if you pass this bill where will these unfortunate people go? Thousands of these people have settled in my district and in my State. They are an industrious, hard-working, and liberty-loving people. They are a home people. They have cleared away the forest, built up nice homes, reared up large families, and many of their descendants are among the most prominent citizens of our State. Wisconsin can not get along without them.

Mr. Chairman, when Kosciusko and Pulaski appeared at our shores and offered their services for the cause of liberty and independence, no one asked them, "Can you read?" One of these Polish patriots gave up his life for the cause of independence. If the Father of this Republic could cast his eyes on a scene being enacted here against a people whence his aids Kosciusko and Pulaski sprang, he would condemn the act.

If you pass this bill, nearly 30 per cent of the Jews will be excluded. For centuries the Jew has been a wanderer on the face of the earth. Persecuted everywhere, he has outlived all. He is the pilgrim of eternity. This country has been his asylum. A race, under the most adverse circumstances, that has produced a Disraeli, a Herschel, a Rubenstein, a Spinoza, is not so out of harmony with us that we can not assimilate them. I would not vote for a bill that would deny admission to a Jew for the simple and silly reason that he can not read.

Mr. Chairman, time will not permit me to dwell on each and every people. Why keep out the Greek? Why the Austrian? Are they so different from us? Read and study the history of these peoples and no one will claim that they are so different they can not be assimilated. Place them in American environment and ere a generation has passed they will be one of us.

I have just mentioned a few of the peoples that will be greatly affected by the passage of this bill. But, Mr. Chairman, how about the German, the French, the Scandinavian, the Bohemian, and others that are so desirable? If this law had been in force in the first decade of this century, nearly 35,000 Germans, over 6,000 French, over 10,000 Irish, over 3,000 Hollanders, over 2,200 Scandinavians, over 1,300 Bohemians, who were all otherwise qualified, would have been denied admission on account of the literacy test. Who here would have denied these good, wholesome immigrants admission? The injustice and unreasonableness of this illiteracy can be multiplied ad infinitum.

If this law had been in force the last decade, over 2,000,000 worthy immigrants would have been denied admission for the simple reason that they were illiterate.

Table showing the percentages of aliens over 14 years of age who would be excluded by a literacy test.

[Abstract of reports of Immigration Commission, Vol. I, p. 99. Number and percentage of immigrants admitted to the United States who were 14 years of age or over and who could neither read nor write, during the fiscal years 1899 to 1910, inclusive, by race or people. Compiled from the reports of the Commissioner General of Immigration.]

Race or people.	Number 14 years of age or over admitted.	Persons 14 years of age or over who could neither read nor write.	
		Number.	Per cent.
African (black).....	30,177	5,733	19
Armenian.....	23,523	5,624	23
Bohemian and Moravian.....	79,721	1,322	1.7
Bulgarian, Servian, and Montenegrin.....	95,596	39,903	41.7
Chinese.....	21,584	1,516	7
Croatian and Slovenian.....	320,977	115,785	36.1
Cuban.....	36,431	2,282	6.3
Dalmatian, Bosnian, and Herzegovinian.....	30,861	12,553	41
Dutch and Flemish.....	68,907	3,043	4.4
East Indian.....	5,724	2,703	47.2
English.....	247,458	3,647	1
Finnish.....	137,916	1,745	1.3
French.....	97,638	6,145	6.3
German.....	625,793	32,236	5.2
Greek.....	208,108	55,089	26.4
Hebrew.....	806,786	209,507	26
Irish.....	416,640	10,721	2.6
Italian (north).....	339,301	38,897	11.5
Italian (south).....	1,690,376	911,566	53.9
Japanese.....	146,172	35,956	24.6
Korean.....	7,259	2,763	38.1
Lithuanian.....	161,441	79,001	48.9
Magyar.....	307,082	35,004	11.4
Mexican.....	32,721	18,717	57.2

Race or people.	Number 14 years of age or over admitted.	Persons 14 years of age or over who could neither read nor write.	
		Number.	Per cent.
Pacific Islander.....	336	83	24.7
Polish.....	861,303	304,675	35.4
Portuguese.....	55,930	38,122	68.2
Roumanian.....	80,839	28,266	35.0
Russian.....	77,479	29,777	38.4
Ruthenian (Rusniak).....	140,775	75,165	53.4
Scandinavian.....	530,434	2,221	.4
Scotch.....	115,788	767	.7
Slovak.....	342,583	82,216	24.5
Spanish.....	46,418	6,724	14.5
Spanish-American.....	9,008	547	6.1
Syrian.....	47,834	25,496	53.3
Turkish.....	12,670	7,536	59.5
Welsh.....	17,075	322	1.9
West Indian (except Cuban).....	9,983	320	3.2
Other peoples.....	11,209	5,001	44.6
Not specified.....	67	5	7.5
Total.....	8,398,624	2,238,801	26.7

In support of this bill the assertion is frequently made: "We do not want the illiterate of Europe." Mr. Chairman, it has been the illiterate immigrant that has been responsible for the decrease of illiteracy in our country. What are the facts as proved by Government statistics? The United States Commissioner of Education, in his letter of transmittal of Bulletin No. 51, just issued, and entitled "Education of the Immigrant," says:

That these people [meaning immigrants] are interested in education of their children, or at least obedient to the school-attendance laws, is shown by the fact that the least illiterate element of our children is the native-born children of foreign-born parents. The illiteracy among the children of native-born parents is three times as great as that among the native-born children of foreign-born parents.

This statement of the Commissioner of Education is borne out by census statistics:

Class.	1890	1900	1910
Native white of native parentage.....	Per cent. 7.5	Per cent. 5.7	Per cent. 3.7
Native white of foreign or mixed parentage.....	2.2	1.6	1.1
Foreign-born white.....	13.1	12.9	12.7

This table shows that the illiteracy among native white of native parentage is 3.7 per cent, and among native white of foreign parentage is only 1.1 per cent. In spite of a steady stream of immigration, illiterate as it may be, the percentage of illiteracy in this country has decreased. In 1890, 13.3 per cent of the people 10 years or older were illiterate; in 1900, only 10.7 per cent were illiterate; and in 1910, 7.7 per cent were illiterate. The illiteracy among the foreign-born population has also decreased. In 1890 it was 13.1 per cent; in 1900, 12.9 per cent; and in 1910, 12.7 per cent. Statistics also show that where the immigrant has settled the illiteracy is less. In the North, where practically all the immigrants from Europe have settled, the illiteracy is less than one-third that of the South, where very few have gone. The following tables are taken from the census of 1910:

Division and section.	Per cent illiterate in population 10 years of age and over: 1910.				
	All classes.	Native white.		Foreign-born white.	Negro.
		Native parentage.	Foreign or mixed parentage.		
United States.....	7.7	3.7	1.1	12.7	30.4
The North.....	4.3	1.4	.9	12.7	10.5
New England.....	5.3	.7	1.3	13.8	7.8
Middle Atlantic.....	5.7	1.2	.8	15.8	7.9
East North Central.....	3.4	1.7	.9	10.1	11
West North Central.....	2.9	1.7	.7	7.6	14.9
The South.....	15.6	7.7	4.3	18.8	33.3
South Atlantic.....	16.0	8	1.2	13.5	32.5
East South Central.....	17.4	9.6	1.7	9.7	34.8
West South Central.....	13.2	5.6	7.7	25.6	33.1
The West.....	4.4	1.7	.8	9.5	7
Mountain.....	6.9	3.6	1.2	12.5	8
Pacific.....	3	.4	.5	8	6.3

Division and State.	Per cent illiterate in population 10 years of age and over: 1910.				
	All classes.	Native white.		Foreign-born white.	Negro.
		Native parent-age.	Foreign or mixed parent-age.		
United States.....	7.7	3.7	1.1	12.7	30.4
Geographic divisions:					
New England.....	5.3	.7	1.3	13.8	7.8
Middle Atlantic.....	5.7	1.2	.8	15.8	7.9
East North Central.....	3.4	1.7	.9	10.1	11
West North Central.....	2.9	1.7	.7	7.6	14.9
South Atlantic.....	16	8	1.2	13.5	32.5
East South Central.....	17.4	9.6	1.7	9.7	34.8
West South Central.....	13.2	5.6	7.7	25.6	33.1
Mountain.....	6.9	3.6	1.2	12.5	8
Pacific.....	3	.4	.5	8	6.3
New England:					
Maine.....	4.1	1.4	4.5	13.7	8
New Hampshire.....	4.6	.8	2.1	14.5	10.6
Vermont.....	3.7	1.2	4	13.1	4.8
Massachusetts.....	5.2	.4	.7	12.7	8.1
Rhode Island.....	7.7	.7	1.8	17.3	9.5
Connecticut.....	6	.5	.8	15.4	6.3
Middle Atlantic:					
New York.....	5.5	.8	.7	13.7	5
New Jersey.....	5.6	1.1	.7	14.7	9.9
Pennsylvania.....	5.9	1.4	1.1	20.1	9.1
East North Central:					
Ohio.....	3.2	1.7	.9	11.5	11.1
Indiana.....	3.1	2.2	1.4	11.7	13.7
Illinois.....	3.7	1.7	.6	10.1	10.5
Michigan.....	3.3	1	1.2	9.3	5.7
Wisconsin.....	3.2	.6	1	8.7	4.5
West North Central:					
Minnesota.....	3	.4	.6	7.6	3.4
Iowa.....	1.7	.9	.6	6.3	10.3
Missouri.....	4.3	3.4	1.2	10.1	17.4
North Dakota.....	3.1	.3	.7	6.3	4.8
South Dakota.....	2.9	.3	.4	5	5.5
Nebraska.....	1.9	.6	.5	7.1	7.2
Kansas.....	2.2	.8	.8	10.5	12
South Atlantic:					
Delaware.....	8.1	3.3	.9	19.8	25.6
Maryland.....	7.2	3	1	11.9	23.4
District of Columbia.....	4.9	.6	.4	8.2	13.5
Virginia.....	15.2	8.2	1.2	9.2	30
West Virginia.....	8.3	6.7	2	23.9	20.3
North Carolina.....	18.5	12.3	3	8.3	31.9
South Carolina.....	25.7	10.5	1.4	6.8	38.7
Georgia.....	20.7	8	1.6	6	36.5
Florida.....	13.8	5.2	2.2	10.5	25.5
East South Central:					
Kentucky.....	12.1	10.7	1.5	8.3	27.6
Tennessee.....	13.6	9.9	1.8	8.3	27.3
Alabama.....	22.9	10.1	2.3	11.3	40.1
Mississippi.....	22.4	5.3	2.2	15.1	35.6
West South Central:					
Arkansas.....	12.6	7.1	2.8	8.9	26.4
Louisiana.....	29	15	3.6	24	48.4
Oklahoma.....	5.6	3.5	1.3	9.8	17.7
Texas.....	9.9	3.3	11.6	30	24.6
Mountain:					
Montana.....	4.8	.3	.4	9.4	7
Idaho.....	2.2	.4	.3	6.9	6.4
Wyoming.....	3.3	.3	.4	9.7	5
Colorado.....	3.7	2	.5	11.3	8.6
New Mexico.....	20.2	15.5	8.9	31	14.2
Arizona.....	20.9	2.3	8.4	31.5	7.2
Utah.....	2.5	.4	.4	5.9	4.8
Nevada.....	6.7	.4	.5	7.6	5.5
Pacific:					
Washington.....	2	.3	.3	4.8	4.3
Oregon.....	1.9	.4	.4	6.1	3.4
California.....	3.7	.5	.6	10	7.1

I have prepared a little table, taking seven States of the North, where so many immigrants have settled, and seven States where very few have gone. This table shows the percentage of foreign born in each State named and the percentage of illiteracy:

	Foreign born.	Illiterate.
	Per cent.	Per cent.
North:		
Massachusetts.....	31.5	5.2
New York.....	30.2	5.5
Minnesota.....	26	3
New Jersey.....	26	5.6
Wisconsin.....	22	3.2
Illinois.....	21.4	3.7
Pennsylvania.....	18.8	5.9
South:		
Louisiana.....	3.2	29
Kentucky.....	1.8	12.1
Virginia.....	1.3	15.2
Alabama.....	.9	22.9
Georgia.....	.6	20.7
South Carolina.....	.4	25.7
North Carolina.....	.3	18.5

Let us take some of the States where so many so-called illiterate foreigners have settled. In New York, where 30.2 per cent of the population is foreign born, the illiteracy is 5.5 per cent; in Pennsylvania, where 18.8 per cent of the population is foreign born, the illiteracy is 5.9 per cent; in Massachusetts, where 31.5 per cent of the population is foreign born, the illiteracy is 5.2 per cent; in Illinois, where 21.4 per cent of the population is foreign born, the illiteracy is 3.7 per cent; in Wisconsin, where 22 per cent of the population is foreign born, the illiteracy is 3.2 per cent. In the State of Alabama, from which comes the author of this bill, in which only nine-tenths of 1 per cent of the population is foreign born, the illiteracy is 22.9 per cent; in Georgia, where six-tenths of 1 per cent of the population is foreign born, the illiteracy is 20.7 per cent; in Kentucky, where 1.8 per cent of the population is foreign born, the illiteracy is 12.1 per cent. Oh, gentlemen will say that is due to the negro population. But compare the tables of these sections and States between the native-born whites and you will find that the illiteracy among the native-born whites of the South is also high.

Those who favor this bill cry out. "We are the dumping ground for the criminal of Europe." Mr. Speaker, it is repeatedly asserted that we do not want the criminal classes of Europe, and a statement by a certain prosecuting attorney in New Jersey is relied upon to prove that illiteracy is a badge of crime. To prove that the increase of crime in this country, if any, can not be placed at the door of the immigrant population I will insert here a table:

Date enumerated.	Total, all classes.	Total foreign-born white.	Percentage of foreign-born white.
1880.....	58,609	12,105	20.6
1890.....	82,329	15,932	19.3
1904.....	81,772	12,945	15.8
1910.....	111,498	19,438	17.4
Committed during:			
1904.....	149,691	35,093	23.4
1910.....	493,934	98,532	19.9

The 1904 census did not include prisoners who were committed for nonpayment of fines, while the 1910 census includes them.

The foregoing table clearly demonstrates that crime better be laid somewhere else instead of at the door of our immigrants. In 1880 the percentage of foreign-born white prisoners to all prisoners was 20.6 per cent; on June 1, 1890, it was 19.3 per cent; on June 30, 1904, it was 15.8 per cent; and on January 1, 1910, it was 17.4 per cent. Of the total number of prisoners committed in year of 1904, 23.4 per cent were foreign-born white, and in year 1910 only 19.9 per cent were foreign-born white. Instead of crime being on the increase among our foreign-born population it is on the decrease; and that, too, in spite of the fact that it is repeatedly charged that the present-day immigrant is styled as an undesirable criminal, while the old immigrant was desirable.

Of the 82,329 prisoners in 1890, 80,153 spoke English, 2,066 did not. Of the 15,932 foreign-born prisoners 14,473 spoke English, 1,448 did not. Over 97 per cent of prisoners spoke English, and over 90 per cent of foreign-born prisoners spoke English. In 1904, 83 per cent of the prisoners were literate and 12.6 per cent were illiterate. Of this illiterate class 1.1 per cent could read but not write; 11.5 per cent could neither read nor write. These figures and percentages do not show that illiteracy is a sign of crime, but, on the contrary, the criminal is literate.

Mr. Chairman, now as to insanity. It is repeatedly charged that insanity is on the increase, and, of course, the whole thing is blamed on the present-day immigrant. The following table, taken from census reports, disproves the fact that the immigrant is responsible:

Date enumerated.	Total all classes.	Total foreign-born white.	Percentage of foreign-born white.
1880.....	91,959	26,334	28+
1890.....	106,254	35,300	33+
1903.....	150,151	47,078	31+
1910.....	187,791	54,758	29+
Admitted during:			
1904.....	49,622	13,405	27+
1910.....	60,769	15,523	25+

Mr. Chairman, an examination of this table tells us to go somewhere else than to the foreign immigrant for our insanity. The same is true as to the feeble-minded.

*Feeble-minded in institutions.*

Date enumerated.	Total all classes.	Total foreign-born white.	Percentage of foreign-born white.
1903.....	14,347	856	5.9
1910.....	20,731	1,247	6
Admitted during:			
1904.....	2,590	152	7
1910.....	3,825	210	5.4

Even pauperism is charged to the immigrant. Let us examine the figures and see:

*Paupers in almshouses.*

Years—		
1850.....	50,253	
1860.....	82,942	
1870.....	76,737	
1880.....	66,203	
1890.....	73,045	
1904.....	81,764	
1910.....	84,198	

From 1880 to 1910 I have the figures showing the number of foreign-born white paupers. In 1880 there were 22,967, or 34 per cent. In 1890 there were 27,648 foreign-born white paupers in almshouses, or 37 per cent; in 1904 there were 32,136, or 39 per cent; in 1910 there were 32,136, or 39 per cent. In 1904 there were admitted 81,412 paupers into almshouses, of whom 31,298 were foreign born, or 38 per cent; and in 1910, out of a total of 88,313 admitted, 33,353, or 37 per cent, were foreign born. These figures show that pauperism is decreasing among foreign born instead of increasing.

It is repeatedly charged that there is too much congestion of the immigrants in our large cities. Does anyone propose to remedy this by the passage of this bill? If the honorable chairman and gentlemen of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization would study the proposition of the proper distribution of immigration and present a bill for that purpose, they would do a greater service to the country than presenting and trying to jam through a bill to choke off immigration, which has been so beneficial to this country. Mr. Chairman, 10,000,000 acres of good farming land await the settler in the northern part of Wisconsin. We have in my State enough undeveloped good farm land to provide thousands of farms, thousands of homes. The foreign immigrant has been the most potent factor in the development of this great Commonwealth. From Germany, from Austria, Bohemia and Hungary, Poland, France, Holland and Belgium, Canada, from England, Ireland, Scotland, and Wales, and in large numbers from the three northern kingdoms, Norway, Sweden, and Denmark, they came. Wisconsin gave them unstintingly of her gifts of plenty and contentment, and they have become loyal citizens of the State and the Nation. What is true of Wisconsin in this regard is true of many other States.

Mr. Chairman, let me give an analysis of the population of Wisconsin as disclosed by the census of 1910. The total population of my State in 1910 was 2,333,860. Of this number 1,807,986 were native-born whites, and 512,569 foreign-born whites; 13,305 constitute the colored population. Of the 1,807,986 native whites 1,044,761 were of foreign or mixed parentage, and 763,225 of native parentage. The total number of foreign-stock whites in my State was 1,557,330, making practically 70 per cent of the population. Mr. Chairman, a better people, a more cosmopolitan, a more industrious and prosperous people, a more home-like and peaceful people, a more liberty-loving people never lived than now live in Wisconsin. From the north of Europe we got the sturdy, stalwart Scandinavian; from the sunny gardens of Italy we got the romantic Italian; from the banks of the Rhine we got the industrious German; from the banks of the Shannon we got the versatile and wide-awake Irishman; from France the polished Frenchman; from Belgium and Holland the home building and progressive Belgian and Dutch. We have got the hard working and home-loving Poles and Bohemians; we have the despised Greek and the persecuted Jews. They have all come to our shores, and I am proud of them all. I am glad they came. Had the proposed bill been a law in the past, I am safe in saying that fully 25 per cent of these people would not have come. And because they came, Mr. Chairman, our State has prospered and grown. It has advanced in industry, in education, and in all that is good in government.

We hear much talk about congestion in cities; we talk about high cost of living and back-to-the-land movement. If this

great Committee on Immigration would study and propose means whereby the immigrant would be distributed throughout our undeveloped portions of the country, one of our existing great problems would be solved.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion let me quote to you brief statements of some of the most prominent citizens of the country on this question. When President Cleveland vetoed an immigration bill in 1897, on account of the literacy test, he used this language:

The ability to read and write as required in this bill, in and of itself, affords, in my opinion, a misleading test of contented industry, and supplies unsatisfactory evidence of desirable citizenship, or a proper apprehension of the benefits of our institutions. If any particular element of our illiterate immigration is to be feared for other causes than illiteracy, these causes should be dealt with directly instead of making illiteracy the pretext for exclusion to the detriment of other illiterate immigrants, against whom the real cause of complaint can not be alleged.

President Taft vetoed a similar bill for the same reason.

On October 21, 1912, President Wilson wrote to Dr. Adler, of Philadelphia, as follows:

23 WEST STATE STREET, TRENTON, N. J.,

October 21, 1912.

Dr. CYRUS ADLER, Philadelphia Pa.

MY DEAR DR. ADLER: \* \* \* I am in substantial agreement with you about the immigration policy which the country ought to observe. I think that this country can afford to use and ought to give opportunity to every man and woman of sound morals, sound mind, and sound body who comes in good faith to spend his or her energies in our life, and I should certainly be inclined, so far as I am concerned, to scrutinize very jealously any restrictions that would limit that principle in practice.

Cordially and sincerely, yours,

WOODROW WILSON.

President Eliot, of Harvard, made the following statement on this important question:

I beg leave to invite your attention to the following statement of the principles which should govern the national legislation on immigration:

- (1) Our country needs the labor of every honest and healthy immigrant who has the intelligence and enterprise to come hither.
- (2) Existing legislation is sufficient to exclude undesirable immigrants.
- (3) Educational tests should not be applied at the moment of entrance to the United States, but at the moment of naturalization.
- (4) The proper education test is capacity to read in English or in the native tongue, not the Bible or the Constitution of the United States, but newspaper items in some recent English or native newspaper which the candidate can not have seen.
- (5) The attitude of Congress and the laws should be hospitable and not repellant.

The only questions which are appropriate are, Is he healthy, strong, and desirous of earning a good living? Many illiterates have common sense, sound bodies, and good characters. Indeed, it is not clear that education increases much the amount of common sense which nature gave the individual. An educational test is appropriate at the time when the foreigner proposes to become a voting citizen. He ought then to know how to read.

Cardinal Gibbons used the following language:

I am not in favor of any educational test as applied to immigrants desiring to enter the United States. Such a law, if passed, would, in my opinion, work great harm, for illiteracy is by no means always ignorance. If the immigrant is industrious and thrifty, he will make a useful citizen, whether he be literate or illiterate. The educated schemer is in more ways than one more dangerous than the honest workman, even though he be illiterate.

President Schurman, of Cornell, wrote as follows:

CORNELL UNIVERSITY,  
Ithaca, N. Y., March 4, 1910.

Hon. JOSEPH F. O'CONNELL,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have your communication of February 23, with the enclosed copy of the letter of ex-President Eliot, of Harvard University, on the subject of the admission of immigrants into the United States. I fully concur in the views expressed by President Eliot, and I do not think I can express them in clearer, more forcible, or appropriate language.

Very truly, yours,

J. G. SCHURMAN.

President Judson, of Chicago, wrote as follows:

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO, February 28, 1910.

Hon. JOSEPH F. O'CONNELL,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: \* \* \* I am not in favor of the restriction of immigration on the basis of the ability to read some European language. There is no doubt that the ability in question is desirable. At the same time the conditions of workingmen in the old country and their conditions in our country are radically different. If they are industrious and honest and thrifty, they will make useful citizens, and their children, having the opportunity of attending our free public schools, will acquire the needed education. \* \* \*

Very truly, yours,

HARRY PRATT JUDSON.

I would rather rely on the opinions of these great men than on the many who are prejudiced.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have disproved by Government statistics every argument that has been presented in support of this bill. I think I have demonstrated conclusively that the immigrant is not responsible for the things that are chargeable against him. The immigrant has in a large degree contributed to our advancement in science and industry. He has enabled us

to become more literate instead of illiterate. Crime, insanity, and pauperism which have been chargeable to the immigrant have decreased instead of increased among our foreign population, and because of these facts I am convinced that the great mass of citizens of this country do not want this bill passed. [Applause.]

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOULDEN].

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Chairman, the bill under consideration, H. R. 6060, has many admirable features that command the approval of all good citizens. In the limited time allowed, I can only give a few brief reasons for my attitude on the measure.

It is generally agreed, I think, that more rigid tests, morally and physically, might be applied to the admission of aliens.

I have been privileged on many occasions to witness the operations of the law at Ellis Island, and am therefore familiar with its application as well as of the character of the immigrants. I was pleased to observe the careful scrutiny of each one, and, when any doubt existed, that the benefit was given to the law and not to the alien.

There is no doubt in my mind that the time is approaching when in self-defense restrictive measures that will largely tend to reduce the number must be adopted.

The literacy test—being able to read in some language or dialect—goes too far at this time and not far enough when restricted measures are needed.

The supply for unskilled manual labor to dig cellars, grade and regulate highways, build roads, work our farms, and so forth, does not equal the demand. As a consequence our farms are being drawn on for that labor that is badly needed to properly cultivate the soil, to keep the production of the necessities of life equal to the consumption.

Abandoned or neglected farms are the direct results of this policy. To remedy it and give the country strong, willing men able to do this heavy, hard work the countries of the Old World must furnish the supply. I know it is popular to join in the cries, "Put up the bars in New York and elsewhere," and "America for Americans." To the latter sentiment, coming from a stock that settled here more than 200 years ago, I am in hearty accord. However, as a school official for many years in New York City, I am familiar with the processes of assimilation to citizenship. Scores of evening schools are filled with thousands of men and women, 16 years of age and over, successfully securing an education. We need these able-bodied men, women, and children for the present, and therefore I am not willing to vote for the literacy test at this time.

When the posts of the Grand Army of the Republic during the Spanish War opened volunteer recruiting places thousands of young men responded, fully one-third being of foreign birth.

If the time has arrived to put up the bars on immigration, then do what the commission, composed of nine, including five Members of Congress, who traveled all over Europe, spending three years on the work, recommended.

The commission, which was authorized by Congress in 1907, issued a report of 42 volumes and suggested seven methods by which restriction might be accomplished, namely:

- (a) The exclusion of those unable to read and write in some language.
- (b) The limitation of the number of each race arriving each year to a certain percentage of the average of that race arriving during a given period of years.
- (c) The exclusion of unskilled laborers unaccompanied by wives or families.
- (d) The limitation of the number of immigrants arriving annually at any port.
- (e) The material increase in the amount of money required to be in the possession of the immigrant at the port of arrival.
- (f) The material increase of the head tax.
- (g) The levy of the head tax so as to make a marked discrimination in favor of men with families.

The words "and write" having disappeared from the first recommendation of the Immigration Commission, that recommendation has lost its force and should not be made the basis for the writing of a bill to revise the immigration laws. Therefore the second recommendation should be considered in connection with the first. This 40-word literacy test is not sufficient in itself. It will prove a failure.

Many letters from individuals and organizations, both for and against this measure, have been received, the latter usually couched in strong and sometimes offensive language. Due consideration was given to both sides, and after listening to the able debate on this question I am constrained to vote against the bill in the interest of the country.

President Cleveland in 1897 and President Taft in 1913 vetoed measures exactly similar to this bill for good and valid reasons.

President Wilson, in a speech just before his election in 1912, declared for a liberal interpretation of laws on immigration,

and, I feel confident, will hesitate before approving a restrictive measure of this character.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I agree fully with the remarks of my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] that this bill must stand or fall on the literacy test, although that test is but a very small portion of the entire text of the bill. The bill is some 60 pages long, and the literacy test consumes about one-sixtieth of that space; yet it is the great factor which must determine every man in this House whether he will vote for or against. If the literacy provision were not included, I suppose there would be no great contest over passage of the bill. I for one can say unreservedly that everything in it, so far as I know, except the literacy test, calls for our support, and would be an improvement so far as it is a change from the present law. But we must rest our case, whether opponents or advocates of the bill, upon that literacy test, because there is the nub of the whole question, and there is the real crux of the issue which has been tearing this country for well-nigh a quarter of a century. I should agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] rather than with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LINDBERGH] that a very large percentage of the type of immigration which has recently been coming into the United States should be kept out by legislation. But I can not agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] that that admission carries with it the conclusion that we must vote for this literacy test or for any bill which contains the literacy test.

The two things are entirely unrelated, and I say that in all deference to the great learning of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] on this subject, and to the great study which he has given to this bill for so many years. It is, I repeat, clear, clear beyond argument, that the two questions are entirely and totally independent, and that a man may believe in the principle of restriction of immigration and at the same time totally disagree with the principle of restriction along the lines of a literacy test. I believe that we should protect the American wage earner, not only directly through a protective tariff, but indirectly by limiting the number of men who may come to the United States and here make the things which the protective tariff is intended to exclude. But let us strive, if we can, to rest that limitation upon some logical ground and not upon a basis which is purely arbitrary—factitious, if you please—and therefore wholly indefensible in principle. The best immigrant, of course we should all agree, is that man who most closely approximates the highest type of manhood, physically, mentally, and morally; and of course we all agree also that a very large proportion of the men who are coming to the shores of the United States every year are not nearly as close to that perfect type as we wish. It therefore seems to me that every man on this floor and in the country who is a real patriot and who really desires to see the continued well-being of the Nation must agree that a justly applied policy of restriction is inevitable.

The only question is in what direction that policy shall be applied. Now, the literacy test does of course restrict, and to that extent it is desirable. But does it have any connection whatever with the physical or the mental or the moral well-being of those who come to this country? I have in my hand a very recent bulletin issued by the Bureau of Education entitled "Education of the Immigrant"; as a sort of preface to the bulletin there is a letter of transmittal signed by the Commissioner of Education of the United States, Dr. Claxton, and addressed to the Secretary of the Interior, in which he uses these very significant words—and, by the way, many of you perhaps noticed the same words, or a paraphrase of them, in yesterday's Washington and New York newspapers. He says:

That these people—

Referring to immigrants—

are interested in the elementary education of their children, or at least obedient to the school-attendance laws, is shown by the fact that the least illiterate element of our population is the native-born children of foreign-born parents. The illiteracy among the children of native-born parents is three times as great as that among the native-born children of foreign-born parents.

Here is the experience of an expert, and a recognized expert, in the subject with which he is dealing. Uninfluenced by the spirit of turmoil and contention which surrounds us here, he views the question from the standpoint of education and from the standpoint of the younger generation, which is growing up to be the citizenship of our country. He points out, by indirection, at least, that there is no connection between the literacy or illiteracy of the immigrants coming to this country to-day and the literacy or illiteracy of the next generation of descendants of the same immigrants. Here is a most effective refutation

of the wisdom of the literacy test. That test has little or no bearing upon the good citizenship of the incoming immigrant, or of his children. It is purely an exclusion measure, based on a total lack of logic. It is founded upon the same sort of reasoning that might be adduced if we should enact that all blue-eyed or brown-eyed men and women should be excluded. I do not believe that in a question of this magnitude, where we are building for the future as well as for to-day, we ought to rest the fabric of the future industrial, commercial, moral, and physical life of the Nation upon an entirely unsound, illogical, and fallacious premise. Upon these grounds, Mr. Chairman, it becomes my duty to register a word of opposition against the passage of a bill which includes the literacy test. [Applause.] I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back one minute.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be recognized now. I desire to yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of New York. Mr. Chairman, at the proper time I shall offer several amendments to this bill, all correlated and having to do with the exclusion, deportation, and repatriation of mentally defective aliens. At the outset I wish to make it plain that, with the exception of the literacy clause, I am in favor of this bill; but I am against the literacy clause only because I believe it to be a wrong way and an ineffective way of accomplishing the desired result.

While it must surely be the purpose of the committee in reporting the literacy clause only to exclude the unfit, yet the literacy clause is founded on the assumption that illiteracy is synonymous with undesirability. The cause of danger to the American race is far deeper, as I shall endeavor to show.

Please bear in mind that the percentage of mental defect among the foreign born in the city of New York, which city I take as an example of the recent immigration from southern Europe as opposed to the older immigration from northern Europe, is 2.48 times the percentage of mental defect among the native born; and whereas the literacy clause is intended to be the means of keeping out undesirables from the southern section of Europe by taking advantage of the fact that opportunities for education there are very limited, yet the percentage of illiteracy in the hospitals of the State of New York among the foreign born is only about 13 per cent as against about 26 per cent of illiteracy among all the aliens admitted to the United States.

Therefore the literacy test will fail to exclude in any considerable quantity the most undesirable of aliens—the mentally defective—while at the same time it will exclude large numbers of highly desirable people who have had no opportunity to learn to read.

The injustice and inadequacy of the literacy clause would therefore appear to be self-evident, and the only real question before this House is the substitution of just and adequate provisions in place of the literacy clause.

I come now to the point of view of the Commission on Immigration which was appointed in 1907, and reported in 1910, on whose recommendations, made after nearly four years of exhaustive investigation, this literacy clause in a modified form was presented to the last Congress. This commission, among other matters, based its conclusions upon its desire to exclude "those physically and morally unfit \* \* \* and inefficient," without any realization of the startling fact, since proven by scientific research, that an enormous proportion of disease, immorality, crime, pauperism, and inefficiency in men, with its equivalent of harlotry in women, is the result of inherited mental disease easily and directly traceable to the parents and grandparents of any individual so affected.

If it can be shown in exact arithmetical proportion what results may be expected from certain inherited qualities, are we not forced to the conclusion that the true way to maintain the glorious standard of the American race is not by a reading test of 30 words, not by a hasty mental examination at an American port, not alone by the observations of trained psychiatrists on shipboard during the long voyages to this country, for which this bill does not provide; not alone by mental examination by trained psychiatrists in the Federal service at the points of embarkation abroad, for which this bill does not provide, but in future years by the personal visit of a trained agent of this Government to the family of the intending immigrant in order that he may see for himself the inheritance which each immigrant has received from his parents, and so determine whether the children of that immigrant, as well as the man himself, be fit for American citizenship?

The amendments I shall offer do not go so far as this. I have no reason to expect that the Members of this House, without careful study of the operation of the Mendelian law as

applied to the heredity of insanity, will agree with me as yet. But I do wish it known that shortly after the Immigration Commission made its report to Congress Dr. Rosanoff proved beyond the question of a doubt the existence of the neuropathic taint as a recessive character, thereby opening the way for better legislation by Congress to-day than was possible from the information before the Immigration Commission three years ago.

Criminals who are serving time are very largely of the feeble-minded class—perhaps 50 per cent—although such meager figures as have been compiled would not show quite such a large percentage. In the study of these subjects we can not do better than to follow the suggestions of Signor Beltrani-Scalia, recently inspector of prisons in Italy, who said:

Leaving aside all abstract speculations and uncertain theories, it is requisite that in moral science we should follow the same path that has been so advantageously taken in the study of natural science \* \* \* because moral facts, as well as those which are called natural facts, have a cause so to be.

If the criminal class is recruited largely from the feeble-minded, and feeble-mindedness is an inherited strain following the Mendelian law, should we not in justice to the American people write into our immigration law something better than the literacy clause?

In 1874-75 there was conducted by Robert L. Dugdale, under the auspices of the Prison Association of New York, an investigation which resulted in the tabulation of the career for five generations of the family which he called Juke. I wish briefly to refer to this family, not with any idea of showing inevitable hereditary criminality, hereditary degeneracy, or hereditary pauperism, but to show the terrific economic waste, the lack of efficiency mentioned in the report of the Commission on Immigration as one of the things to be guarded against from immigrants, because we have enough of it in this country now.

The Juke family lived in a rocky, inaccessible part of the State of New York. Five hundred and forty of their descendants, blood relatives all, and 169 related by marriage or cohabitation are registered in Mr. Dugdale's report. He assumes that collateral branches which he had no opportunity to examine would increase the number of this family to 1,200, and on the actual record of 709 Jukes that he does know about he figures the economic loss to the community for 75 years from this family of 1,200 as follows:

	Number.	Cost.
Total number of persons	1,200	
Number of pauperized adults	280	
Cost of almshouse relief		\$15,000
Cost of outdoor relief		32,250
Number of criminals and offenders	140	
Years of imprisonment	140	
Cost of maintenance at \$200 a year		28,000
Number of arrests and trials	250	
Cost of arrests and trials, \$100 each		25,000
Number of habitual thieves, convicted and unconvicted	60	
Number of years of deprivation, at 12 years each	720	
Cost of deprivation, \$120 a year		86,400
Number of lives sacrificed by murder	7	
Value of lives, at \$1,200 each		8,400
Number of common prostitutes	50	
Average number of years of debauch	15	
Total number of years of debauch	750	
Cost of maintenance, at \$300 each		225,000
Number of women specifically diseased	40	
Average number of men each woman contaminates with permanent disease	10	
Total number of men contaminated	400	
Number of wives contaminated by above men	40	
Total number of persons contaminated	440	
Cost of drugs and medical treatment during rest of life, at \$200 each		88,000
Average loss of wages caused by disease during rest of life, in years	3	
Total years of wages lost by 400 men	1,200	
Loss, at \$500 a year		600,000
Average number of years withdrawn from productive industry by each courtesan	10	
Total number of years lost by 50 courtesans	500	
Value, estimated at \$125 a year		62,500
Aggregate curtailment of life of 490 adults, equivalent to 50 mature individuals	50	
Cash cost, each life at \$1,200		60,000
Aggregate of children who died prematurely	300	
Average years of life of each child	2	
Cash cost, each child at \$50		15,000
Number of prosecutions in bastardy	30	
Average cost of each case, \$100		3,000
Cost of property destroyed, blackmail, brawls		20,000
Average capital employed in houses, stock, furniture, etc., for brothels		6,000
Compound interest for 26 years, at 6 per cent		18,000
Charity distributed by church		10,000
Charity obtained by begging		5,450
Total		1,308,000

Over a million and a quarter dollars of loss in one family in 75 years. Without attempting to draw any conclusions in the matter of heredity, I would merely suggest that if in this known family of 709 persons in five generations there were 91 illegitimately born, 128 prostitutes, 67 syphilitics, 64 paupers, 142 who received almshouse relief, and 76 criminals, what will be the economic loss before this strain is exhausted?

I had hoped to be able to present to this House the record of the Juke family brought down to date, but I have a telegram from Dr. C. B. Davenport in charge of this work, saying that it is not yet completed.

I will, however, mention another family called "Nam," whose record by Dr. Davenport is brought down to 1912. On a balance sheet similar to the Jukes 1,795 members of this family in seven generations show an economic loss to the State of \$1,411,676, but in this computation I have substituted for liquor bills an equivalent of productive labor lost.

Again, the "Hill" family of 737 persons shows an economic loss to the community in five generations up to 1912 of \$498,260.

Please remember that each of these families originated from but two people, and our immigration in some years is over a million immigrants per year. These figures must suggest careful selection of our future citizens, if only from an economic point of view.

Now, with regard to those morally unfit to enter this country, as suggested by the report of the Immigration Commission, I shall again quote a line from Signor Beltrani-Scalia:

Moral facts, as well as those which are natural facts, have a cause so to be.

During the year 1913 just passed there appeared a book called *The Kallikak Family*. This is the pseudonym of a family on whose illegitimate side in the sixth generation is now a girl called Deborah in an institution for the feeble-minded at Vineland, N. J. In the course of the usual investigation into the heredity and environment of the patient, this startling fact was discovered: Just prior to the Revolutionary War one Martin Kallikak, a young man of very good family, had, by the feeble-minded daughter of an innkeeper, an illegitimate son. A few years later Martin Kallikak married a normal woman of his own station in life, and their descendants to the present sixth generation have been estimable citizens, proudly bearing one of the most honored names in the Commonwealth of New Jersey. So, starting with Martin Kallikak, we have presented two branches of a great family, starting from the same head, the one branch normal, strong, creditable, an asset to the State; the other weak, feeble-minded, discreditable, a continuing liability to the State; the one whose membership comprises business and professional men of the highest repute, the other branch of the same name of whose 480 known direct descendants 143 have been feeble-minded and but 46 normal, with the rest unknown or undetermined. Can there be any doubt of the heritage of feeble-mindedness? A mere glance at the sinister Kallikak record of illegitimacy, harlotry, alcoholism, incest, and crime is sufficient.

Now, if feeble-mindedness is hereditary, along what lines does it show itself? If there were any doubt of this hereditary quality, we should scarcely expect to find the known law of biology—the Mendelian law—to be its method of transmission, yet so it is—as in plants, so in people.

The Mendelian law is named after its discoverer, an Austrian monk called Gregor Mendel. In his garden, in the year 1866, he made some experiments, crossing tall and dwarf peas, and found that the tall peas contained a "dominant" character which the dwarf peas lacked. They were "recessive" for the lack of that element which makes the tall peas tall. Mendel crossed the tall with the dwarf, and in the first generation all were tall peas. He then permitted these tall peas that had a single or simplex "recessive" strain to fertilize themselves, and found in the second generation three tall peas to one dwarf pea, and so on through subsequent generations. This law, though lost sight of until 1900, has since then been found to apply to the color of the hair, albinism, brachydactylism, and to other human traits. As I said before, Dr. Rosanoff has not only made certain of the application of the Mendelian law to the inheritance of feeble-mindedness, but in so doing has for all time put the normal mind in the "dominant" class and the feeble mind in the "recessive" class. It is comforting to have the odds 3 to 1 in one's favor even after the first generation.

Dr. Rosanoff hunted up the antecedents of some hundreds of patients who were confined in the Kings Park (N. Y.) State Hospital for the Insane, made out a table of expectancy based on the Mendelian law, and arrived at these results:

Of the 64 offspring of 17 matings all of whose parents had the neuropathic constitution, according to the Mendelian law

all these 64 children would be neuropathic. Dr. Rosanoff found but 54 who were neuropathic, although 8 are still too young to be determined.

Of 169 children of 37 matings one of whose parents in each case had the neuropathic constitution, according to the Mendelian law 84½ would be neuropathic. Dr. Rosanoff found 84 neuropathic and 85 normal, and so on. I append hereto the complete table with some necessary explanations:

Types of mating.	Number of matings.	Total number of offspring.	Died in childhood.	Data unascertained.	Neuropathic offspring.		Normal offspring.	
					Actual findings.	Theoretical expectation.	Actual findings.	Theoretical expectation.
a. RR × RR = RR	17	75	11	0	54	64	10	0
b. DR × RR = DR + RR	37	216	46	1	84	84½	85	84½
b1. DR × RR = DR + RR	56	284	20	4	106	130	154	130
c. DD × RR = DR	14	61	13	3	0	0	45	45
d. DR × DR = DR + 2 DR + RR	7	34	5	0	8	7½	21	21½
d1. DR × DR = DR + 2 DR + RR	55	335	39	3	99	73½	194	219½
e. DD × DR = DD + DR	20	92	12	3	0	0	77	77
DD × DD = DD	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total.....	206	1,097	146	14	351	359	586	578

"Some of the data represented in the table require special explanation.

"Among the offspring which resulted from matings of the first type, RR × RR, 10 are recorded as being normal, although theoretically all should be neuropathic. Of these 10, 1 died at the age of 38 years, in an accident; during life suffered from asthma; had a son who died in convulsions. Another is described as being easy-going; is somewhat odd and, possibly, abnormal in make-up; is 29 years of age. The rest are from 8 to 22 years of age. In other words, in 2 of the 10 subjects the neuropathic constitution is not positively excluded and the remaining 8 have not reached the age of incidence.

"The matings of the second and fourth types, DR × RR and DR × DR, respectively, have been divided into two groups each, as already explained in the preceding section. Thus, groups b and d in the chart include the matings in which the simplex condition of either or both mates, as the case may be, is definitely ascertained, the existence of neuropathic manifestations either in ancestors or in collateral relatives of the subjects appearing in the pedigrees. Groups b<sub>1</sub> and d<sub>1</sub>, on the other hand, include the matings in which the simplex condition of either or both mates is assumed to exist on the basis of the character of the offspring. It is perhaps not surprising that groups b<sub>1</sub> and d<sub>1</sub> are larger than b and d, respectively, when we consider the great likelihood of a neuropathic taint, derived from an ancestor of a remote generation, being transmitted many times in the shape of a simplex condition, and, at the same time, the fact that our investigations extended in almost all cases no further back than the generation of grandparents."

That *The Kallikak Family* was not written by Dr. Goddard in order to prove the application of the Mendelian law is shown by his brief reference to the law on pages 109 to 117. I asked Dr. Rosanoff to take just such information as was tabulated in *The Kallikak Family* and see if the theoretical expectation according to the Mendelian law corresponded with the facts.

I now present the following table for the Record, in condensed form, and will only comment on it to the extent that out of a total of 502 cases there was only a difference between the theoretical expectation and the actual findings of two offspring. I do not pretend that from the meager facts which I have presented in the original investigations of Dr. Rosanoff, mentioned above, and his application of the Mendelian law to *The Kallikak Family*, that we are in possession of all the scientific facts which will be necessary before we can arrive at the proper solution of the problems of crime, pauperism, and degeneracy, but I do think they are sufficient to show the tendency of modern scientific research, and that the Members of this House should not be satisfied with the now antiquated findings of the Immigration Commission with regard to mental disease in its application to the problem of immigration.

Types of mating.	Number of matings.	Total number of offspring.	Died in infancy or data unascertained.	Normal offspring.		Feeble-minded offspring.	
				Theoretical expectation.	Actual findings.	Theoretical expectation.	Actual findings.
RR×RR=RR.....	42	150	47	.....	2	103	101
DR×RR=DR+RR....	11	44	13	15½	15	15½	16
DD×RR=DR.....	8	16	4	12	12	.....	.....
DR×DR=DD+2DR+RR.....	1	4	2	1½	1	½	1
DD×DR=DD+DR.....	178	389	35	354	354	.....	.....
DD×DD=DD.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Total.....	240	603	101	383	384	119	118

The great State of New York is more interested, probably, than any other State, because, as Chairman BURNETT suggests on page 5 of his report on this bill, it costs the State nearly \$4,000,000 a year to take care of the alien insane who have slipped past the immigration authorities because of the insufficiency of the present law and its nonenforcement because of lack of funds.

Before I proceed to show what burdens are now unjustly placed on the State of New York and other States in varying amounts, I wish to refer briefly to the history of immigration legislation in order to show what is the mess of pottage for which the State of New York sold its birthright to protect itself from the influx of undesirables.

As far back as 1847 the State of New York created a commission of emigration, whose duty it was to properly safeguard and help to employment all the alien immigrants arriving at the port of New York for a period of five years after their arrival, the funds for which purpose were created by a small commutation payment by each immigrant. Between the years 1847 and 1855 this State emigration commission paid to the State of New York \$2,250,000 as the State's share of the cost of the support of those aliens who within five years had become a public charge. The following table shows the efficiency of the service rendered by the commissioners of emigration in caring for the aliens with funds paid by themselves between May 5, 1847, and December 31, 1872:

Number of alien immigrants arrived at the port of New York from May 5, 1847, to December 31, 1872, for whom commutation money was paid.....	5,033,392
Of which number the commissioners of emigration provided and cared for out of the emigrant fund for a greater or less period during the five years subsequent to arrival, as follows:	
Number treated and cared for in the institutions of the commissioners of emigration.....	398,643
Number supplied temporarily with board, lodging, and money relief in the city of New York.....	499,275
Number provided with employment through labor bureau at Castle Garden.....	349,936
Number forwarded from Castle Garden to destination in United States at their own request.....	53,083
Number relieved and provided for in various counties and institutions at the expense of commissioners of emigration.....	214,642
	1,465,579

On August 3, 1882, the Federal Government assumed control of the alien problem and assessed a tax on shipowners of 50 cents for each alien passenger landed at the ports of the United States. The act of August 3, 1882, provided in part that the Secretary of the Treasury should provide for the support and relief of such immigrants as may fall into distress or need public aid under the rules and regulations to be prescribed by said Secretary. For the time being it recognized the principle of relieving local communities from the burden of helpless immigrants, and permitted all those who became public charges within one year after their arrival from causes existing prior to landing to be deported and their expenses while dependent prior to deportation to be paid to the local authorities by the steamship companies.

By the act of March 3, 1903, aliens who are found to be public charges from causes existing prior to landing could be deported at any time within two years. The period of deportation was again extended by the amendment of February 20, 1907, when the period of deportation was made three years. This act of February 20, 1907, still recognized the principle of Federal responsibility for dependent aliens in the following terms:

The money (\$4 head tax) so collected, together with all fines and rentals collected under the laws regulating the immigration of aliens into the United States, shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States and shall constitute a permanent immigration fund, to be used

under the direction of the Secretary of Commerce and Labor to defray the expenses of regulating the immigration of aliens into the United States under said laws, including the contract labor laws, the cost of reports of decisions of the Federal courts and digests thereof for use of the Commissioner General of Immigration, and the salaries and expenses of all officers, clerks, and employees appointed to enforce the said laws.

As the last straw to break the camel's back, the act of March 4, 1909, provided that—

On and after July 1, 1909 (35 Stats., p. 982), all head tax collected pursuant to the provisions of section 1 of the said act of February 20, 1907, together with all fines and rentals collected and moneys received from other sources under the laws regulating the immigration of aliens into the United States, shall be covered into the Treasury to the credit of miscellaneous receipts.

Since July 1, 1909, about a million dollars a year has been covered into the general fund of the Treasury over what has been spent in the enforcement of the immigration law, thereby making out of the head tax a revenue measure.

At the port of New York alone ex-Commissioner Williams has publicly stated in 1912 that this Government annually collects over \$3,000,000 in revenue through the head tax imposed on immigrants who arrive at Ellis Island, which is more than twice the amount appropriated for expenditures there, and as a final climax the Secretary of Labor last month issued an order that after January 1, 1914, no further payment should be made for the care of deportable aliens in State institutions between the time of their certification for deportation and their actual embarkation. The amount received for this last purpose by the State of New York during the past few years has, of course, been small, but it shows the tendency of legislation and the utter neglect of the Federal Government even to use the money which it requires that each alien shall pay into the Public Treasury before he can enter the United States for the care and maintenance of the very aliens who pay in this money. I claim that the head tax was never intended as a revenue measure; that since 1909 immeasurable injustice has been done to the States which have had to harbor dependent aliens who with reasonable amendments to the immigration law and an adequate enforcement of its provisions should have been originally excluded from our shores.

As I have said, Mr. BURNETT, on page 5 of his report to accompany this bill, refers to the fact that it costs the State of New York nearly \$4,000,000 a year to take care of its alien insane. According to the enumeration made February 10, 1912, there were in the State hospitals of the State of New York 13,163 foreign-born patients. It costs the State of New York \$262 per annum for each patient, which makes a total of \$3,448,706 expended by the State of New York in the year 1912 for the maintenance of the alien insane. The average hospital life of each patient is 11 years, so that if the alien insane continue to be admitted to the hospitals of the State of New York in the same numbers as in the year 1912, the State stands confronted with the necessity of raising by taxation the sum of \$37,935,766 to care for 13,163 of the alien insane during their hospital lives. I maintain that if Congress would adopt some amendments to this bill based on information acquired after the Immigration Commission had reported to Congress, this staggering outlay to the State of New York could largely be saved, and the States of New Hampshire, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Indiana, Illinois, West Virginia, and South Carolina especially, which are cooperating with the State hospital commission of the State of New York in the endeavor to present this deplorable situation in its true light—not to mention the other States which are less directly affected—would all be saved their proper proportion.

In conclusion I append a bibliography for the convenience of any Member who may be interested, and I will merely say that my amendments are offered to perfect a very good bill which has as its chief weakness the literacy clause. With due regard for the admirable report of the Immigration Commission on other subjects, I nevertheless believe that the subject of mental defect is worthy of more thought than was given it by the commission. Of the 41 volumes of the commission's report, only 24 pages are devoted to its consideration, and this brief comment finishes as follows:

The situation with respect to insanity among immigrants, as indicated by the data and authorities upon which this report is based, may be summarized as follows: Although the immigration of mentally unsound aliens is prohibited by law, and although many mentally diseased or defective aliens are turned back at the ports of entry, there are in the United States many thousands of insane or feeble-minded persons of foreign birth. It appears that insanity is relatively more prevalent among the foreign born than among the native born, and relatively more prevalent among certain immigrant races or nationalities than among others. In general, the nationalities furthest advanced in civilization show, in the United States, a higher proportion of insane than do the more backward races. For the high ratio of insanity among the foreign born, several causes have been assigned, and while it is difficult to determine the values of the various factors,

it is probably true that racial traits or tendencies have a more or less important influence. A further cause of mental disease is probably to be found in the total change in climate, occupation, and habits of life which the majority of immigrants experience after arrival in the United States.

The provisions of the immigration law of 1907 for the exclusion of mentally unsound persons are seemingly complete and comprehensive, while the enforcement of such provisions is doubtless as satisfactory as can be expected, in view of conditions under which arriving immigrants must be inspected.

In view of the facts previously stated in my remarks, I can not agree with the commission.

In the light of recent scientific research, I am forced to the belief that, by reason of the inherited qualities of mental soundness or defect, this House in this legislation must now decide whether, by adopting the unjust and inefficient literacy clause, it will burden our splendid and unequaled race with defectives, degenerates, and criminals through unnumbered generations, or whether, by rejecting the literacy clause and by substituting therefor some wise amendments, it will admit the progenitors of normal, sane, and industrious citizens, whose good qualities through the years to come will be transmitted unimpaired to their sturdy American descendants.

I expect to offer the following amendments:

On page 7 strike out all beginning with line 15, down to and including the word "Provided," in line 24, page 8, as follows:

That after four months from the approval of this act, in addition to the aliens who are by law now excluded from admission into the United States, the following persons shall also be excluded from admission thereto, to wit:

All aliens over 16 years of age, physically capable of reading, who can not read the English language or some other language or dialect, including Hebrew or Yiddish: *Provided*, That any admissible alien or any alien heretofore or hereafter legally admitted, or any citizen of the United States, may bring in or send for his father or grandfather over 55 years of age, his wife, his mother, his grandmother, or his unmarried or widowed daughter, if otherwise admissible, whether such relative can read or not; and such relative shall be permitted to enter. That for the purpose of ascertaining whether aliens can read the immigrant inspectors shall be furnished with slips, of uniform size, prepared under the direction of the Secretary of Labor, each containing not less than 30 nor more than 40 words in ordinary use, printed in plainly legible type in the various languages and dialects of immigrants. Each alien may designate the particular language or dialect in which he desires the examination to be made, and shall be required to read the words printed on the slip in such language or dialect. No two aliens coming in the same vessel or other vehicle of carriage or transportation shall be tested with the same slip. That the following classes of persons shall be exempt from the operation of the illiteracy test, to wit: All aliens who shall prove to the satisfaction of the proper immigration officer or to the Secretary of Labor that they are seeking admission to the United States solely for the purpose of escaping from religious persecution; all aliens in transit through the United States; all aliens who have been lawfully admitted to the United States and who later shall go in transit from one part of the United States to another through foreign contiguous territory: *Provided*.

On page 20, line 1, strike out all after the word "landing" to the word "passenger" in line 5, and substitute the following:

The Secretary of Labor shall assign a surgeon of the United States Public Health Service, not lower in rank than assistant surgeon, trained in psychiatry, who shall be received and carried on each vessel transporting immigrant passengers.

On page 20, in line 25, strike out the words "if requested by the examining board."

On page 38, line 15, strike out the word "three" and substitute the word "five."

On page 38, in line 16, strike out the words "from causes existing prior to the landing" and substitute "unless the said alien can show to the satisfaction of the Secretary of Labor that the causes for becoming a public charge did not exist prior to the landing."

On page 42, line 6, strike out the word "may" and substitute the word "shall."

On page 42, line 9, strike out the words "in like manner" and substitute "at the expense of the appropriation for the enforcement of this act," so as to read:

He shall employ a suitable person for that purpose who shall accompany such alien to his or her final destination, and the expense incident to such service shall be defrayed at the expense of the appropriation for the enforcement of this act.

On page 42 add a new section, to be known as section 20 a, to read as follows:

That hereafter it shall be unlawful for the owner, agent, or master of a transportation company or vessel engaged in the transportation of aliens into the United States to refuse to sell tickets for transportation to his or her native country or, having sold tickets for such transportation, to receive on board, any alien who was brought to the United States by a vessel owned by such transportation company or owner, or his or her legal successors or assigns, who, at the time that application for such ticket shall be made, shall be an inmate of any institution in the United States which is supported wholly or in part by public funds: *Provided*, That the arrival of such alien by a vessel owned by such transportation company or owner shall be verified by a United States commissioner of immigration: *Provided further*, That it shall be certified by the superintendent or principal medical officer of such public institution that such alien inmate is in condition to travel with safety to himself or herself or others: *Provided further*, That such alien inmate is not suffering from a quarantinable disease: *Provided further*, That when necessary for the safety of such alien inmate, a

suitable attendant shall be provided without expense to such transportation company or owner.

That any person, including the owner, agent, or master of any transportation company or vessel, who shall refuse to sell tickets for the transportation of such alien inmates or, having sold such tickets, shall refuse to receive such alien inmates on board, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and shall on conviction be punished by fine not exceeding \$500 for each and every such alien inmate for whom transportation is received or who is not received on board.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY.—PSYCHIATRY.

- A. Alzheimer: Ist die Einrichtung einer Psychiatrischen Abteilung im Reichsgesundheitsamt erstrebenswert? Zeitsch. f. d. ges. Neurol. u. Psych. Orig., 6, 242, 1911.
- De Ameline: L'hérédité, et en particulier de l'hérédité similaire dans la paralysie générale. Annales Med.-Psychol., Mai u. Juni, 1900.
- G. Anton: Alkoholismus und Erblichkeit. Psych. Wochenschr., Nr. 14, 1901.
- E. Apert: Maladies Familiales et maladies congenitales. Paris, 364 S., 1907.
- F. S. Arnaud: Les Maladies mentales familiales. Revue de Psychiatrie, n. s., III, Paris, 1900.
- Benedikt, Degenerationskrankheiten des Nervensystems. Deutsche med. Wochenschr., Nr. 35, 1906.
- J. Berze: Die Hereditären Beziehungen der dementia præcox. Leipzig-Wien, 1910. Die Manisch-depressive Familie H. Beitrag zur Hereditätslehre. Monatsschr. f. Psych., 26, 270, 1909.
- R. Bing: Die Heredofamiliären Degenerationen des Nervensystems in erblichkeitstheoretischer allgemeopathologischer, rassen-biologischer Beziehung. Med. Klin., 1906. Heredofamiliäre Nervenkrankheiten. Deutsches Archiv f. klin. Medizin, 83, H. 3 u. 4, 1905.
- E. Bischoff: Ueber Familiäre Geisteskrankheiten. Jahrb. f. Psych., S. 109, 1905.
- Blin, Contribution à l'étude de l'hérédité dans les états mentaux de l'enfant. Congr. internat. de med. C. r. Paris 1900, sect. de psych., 522.
- Josef Shaw Bolton: Evidence as to the existence of heredity of insanity and of a parental and family degeneracy in the subjects of dementia paralytica. Journal of Mental Science, 54, 26, 1908.
- Bourneville: Note Statistique sur le rôle de la consanguinité dans l'étiologie de l'épilepsie, de l'hystérie, de l'idiotie et de l'imbecillité. Progr. Med., 4, Mai, 1901.
- A. Brachet: Pathologie mentale des rois de France, Louis XI et ses ascendants. Paris, 1903.
- Bratz, Ueber Vererbung. Vortrag in Psychiatrischen Verein zu Berlin, Sitzung vom 18. Dezember, 1909. Mit Diskussion. Neurol. Centralbl., Nr. 2, 1910.
- Anne Burnet: A study of heredity among the women in the State Hospital at Clarinda, Iowa. Womans M. J., Toledo, 9, 375-380, 1900.
- G. Buscham: Bedeutung der Verwandtschaftsberatung für die Nachkommenschaft. Neuland des Wissens, 1, 1910.
- Cannon and Rosanoff: Preliminary report of a study of heredity in insanity in the light of the Mendelian laws. Journ. of Nervous and Mental Diseases, 38, 272, 1911.
- W. H. Cox: Degeneratie, eene copulatieve correlatiestoornis. Psychiatrische en Neurologische Bladen, 1907, No. 1, 77 S., 8°, 6 tafeln. Ref. im. Archiv f. Rass.- u. Ges.-Biol., 1908, S. 125.
- Charles F. Dana: The modern views of heredity with the study of a frequently inherited psychosis. Medical Record, 77, 245, 1910.
- Otto Diem: Die Psycho-neurotische erbliche Belastung der Geistesgesunden und der Geisteskranken. Archiv f. Rass.- u. Ges.-Biol., 2, 215-252 u. 336-368, 1905.
- Doran: A consideration of the hereditary factors in epilepsy. Amer. Journ. of Insanity, 60, 1903.
- Elmiger: Beiträge zum Irresein bei Zwillingen. Psych.-Neurol. Wochenschr., Nr. 8, S. 78; Nr. 9, S. 85; 1910-1911.
- J. Ermakow: Observations Personnelles sur les Psychoses alcooliques et l'hérédité alcoolique chez les battants de la guerre russo-japonnaise. Arch. intern. de neurol., 1909; ref. Neurol. Centralbl., 1910, S. 1357.
- B. Etchepare: Folle Familiale, délire d'interprétation antilogique communiqué entre sept personnes. Annales méd.-psychol., 68, 5, 1910.
- Fausser, Endogene Symptomenkomplexe bei exogenen Krankheitsformen. Allgem. Zeitschr. f. Psych., 62, 165.
- Eleanore Fischen: Die Beziehung der Heredität periodischen Irresein. Monatsschr. f. Psych., 7, 127, 224. Berlin, 1900.
- F. G. Fitzgerald: A study of phases of family psychosis. Bull. of the Ontario Hospitals for the Insane, 2, 23, 1908.
- Foerster, Ueber die Klinischen Formen der Psychosen bei direkter Erblichkeit. Mit Diskussion. Allgem. Zeitschr. f. Psych., 64, H. 1, S. 176, 1907.
- Fornaca: Sull' influenza dell'ereditarietà morbosa nella paralisi Progressiva. Rivista sperim. di freniatria, 33, Fascic II, III, 1907.
- F. Foque: Maladies mentales familiales. Paris, 1900.
- K. Frankhauser: Geschwisterpsychosen. Zeitsch. f. d. ges. Neurol. u. Psych. Orig. 5, 52, 1911.
- L. O. Fuller: Alcoholism, crime, and insanity. Journ. of Mental Science, 55, 692, 1909. Aetiology (heredity), S. 700.
- V. L. Gallippe: L'hérédité des stigmates de dégénérescence et les familles souveraines. Paris, 1905. Masson et Cie. et Gaz. des hôp., S. 903, 1905. Hérédité similaire. Revue de méd., No. 11 et 12, 1901.
- Goddard: Heredity of feeble-mindedness. Amer. Breeders' Magazine, 1, Nr. 3, S. 165-178, 1910, Washington, D. C.
- C. Goring: On the inheritance of the diathesis of phthisis and insanity: a statistical study, based upon the family history of 1,500 criminals. Drapers Co. Research memoirs, Department of Applied Mathematics. University College, London; published by Dulau & Co., 3 shillings, 1909.
- Gottgetreu: Die Bedeutung der Vererbung bei der Dementia paralytica. Inaug.-Diss. Jena, 1902.
- Gowers: Heredity in diseases of the nervous system. Brit. med. Journ., 1908.
- Gräter: Dementia præcox mit alcoholismus chronicus. Aetiologie, S. 178 u. f. Leipzig, 1909.
- E. Hahnle: Der heutige Stand der Erblichkeitsfrage in der Neuro-psychopathologie. Neurol. Centralbl., Nr. 18, S. 843, 583, 892, 1904.
- Hartmann: Ueber die hereditären Verhältnisse bei Verbrechern. Monatsschr. f. Kriminalpsychol., I. Jahrg., S. 493, 1904.
- W. H. Hartzell: The burden of hereditary mental diseases. Lehigh Valley, M. Mag., Easton, Pa., 12, 21-27, 1901.
- Hermann: Paralytikerinder. Münch. med. Wochenschr., Nr. 20, S. 1025 bis 1027, 1909.
- David Heron: A first study of the statistics of insanity and the inheritance of the insane diathesis, No. 2, der Eugenics Laboratory

- Memoirs, of Francis Galton Laboratory for National Eugenics. London, 1907. Dulau & Co., 33 S.
- Joseph Hirschl: Adolph, Zur Aetiologie der Dementia præcox. Vortrag, gehalten im Verein f. Psych. u. Neurol. in Wien am 12. März, 1907. Jahrb. f. Psych.
- A. Hoche: Zur Frage der erblichen Belastung bei Geisteskrankheiten. Med. Klin., Nr. 18, S. 427, 1905. Kultur und Geisteskrankheit. Freiburg i. Br., 1910.
- W. Jakowenko: Erblichkeit bei Geisteskrankheit. 1904, H. 3 des Journ. neuropathol. i. psych. (Organ der Neuropathol. Gesellschaft zu Moskau). 1905, S. 683. Ref. in Centralbl. f. Neurol. u. Psych., S. 683, 1905.
- G. R. Jeffrey: The significance of heredity and the neuro-insane constitution as important factors in the production of mental disease. Journ. of ment. Sc., Vol. 56, 273-196, April, 1910.
- Ernst Jendrassik: Beiträge zur Kenntnis der hereditären Krankheiten. Deutsche Zeitschr. f. Nervenheilk., 22, H. 5, u. 6, 1902.
- Die Hereditären Krankheiten. Lewandowskis Handb. d. Neurol., 2, 321. Berlin, 1911.
- J. Joergler: Die Familie Zero. Archiv f. Rass- u. Ges.-Biol., 2, 494, 1905.
- W. H. S. Jones, R. Ross, and G. G. Ellett: Malaria, a neglected fact in the history of Greece and Rome. Cambridge, 1907.
- Kalmus, Untersuchungen über erbliche Belastung. 6. Jahresversamm. Nord-deutsch. Psychiater u. Neurologen. Centralbl. f. Nervenheilk. u. Psych., S. 75, 1905.
- Karpas und J. Morris: Contribution to our knowledge of the aetiology of dementia præcox. New York Med. Journ., 5 n. 12, Dez., 1908.
- J. P. Karplus: Zur Kenntnis der Variabilität und Vererbung am Zentralnervensystem des Menschen und einiger Säugetiere. Leipzig u. Wien, 1907.
- Kekule v. Stradonitz: Die Untersuchung von Vererbungsfragen und die Degeneration der spanischen Habsburger. Archiv f. Psych., 35, H. 3, 1902.
- Kirchhoff: Fragen aus dem Gebiete der Erblichkeit. Allgem. Zeitschr. f. Psych., 56, 6, S. 871.
- Phillip Coombs Knapp: Heredity in diseases of the nervous system, with especial reference to heredity in epilepsy. Read at the meeting of the Amer. Neurol. Assoc. at Washington, 8. May, 1907.
- C. (Prag) Kneidl: Beiträge zur Statistik und Aetologie der Epilepsie (Casopsis ces lck Prag, 1904). Ref. Neurol. Centralbl., S. 220, 1905.
- J. L. A. Koch: Die Erbliche Belastung bei den Psychopathien. Kinderfehler, 8. Jahrg., 1903, H. 1.
- W. König: The problem of heredity from the psychiatric aspect. Brit. med. Journ., Oct. 15, No. 2285.
- Emil Kraepelin: Zur Entartungsfrage Centralbl. f. Nervenheilk. u. Psych., 2. Oktoberheft, 1908.
- W. C. Krauss: Heredity, with study of the statistics of the New York State hospitals. Buffalo, M. J., n. 3, 41, 892-890, 1901-1902.
- Keeneburg Krauss: Ueber Vererbung von Geisteskrankheiten. 23 Versamm. d. sudwestdeutscher Irrenärzte in Stuttgart am 1. u. 2. Sept., 1902. Allgem. Zeitschr. f. Psych., S. 224, 1903.
- Rosa Krelchgauger: Zur Frage der Vererbung von Geisteskrankheiten. Inaug.-Dis., Freiburg i. Br., 1909, u. Centralbl. f. Neurol. u. Psych., S. 877-885, 1909.
- L. Lagriffe: Recherches sur l'hérédité dans les maladies mentales. Archives d'anthropologie, criminelle et méd. légale, 1910.
- Lange Fe, Middelfart, Dänemark: Degeneration in Families: Observations in a lunatic asylum. Engl. Uebersetzung, London, 1907. 8°, 3s. 6d. net. Jagttagelser fra en Sindsygeanstalt Slaegter. Kopenhagen, 1904. 146 S., 3 Kr.
- Marco Levi-Branchini: Sull' età di comparsa e sull' influenza dell' ereditarietà nella patogenesi della demenza primitiva o precoce. Rivista sperim. di freniatria 29, Fasc. 3.
- W. Lewis: Alcoholism, crime and insanity. Journ. of Mental Science, 52, 203, 1906. Heredity, S. 212.
- Liepmann: Psychose der Mutter und Psychose der Tochter, mit Krankenvorstellung. Sitzung d. Psychiatr. Verein zu Berlin vom 24. Juni, 1905. Allgem. Zeitschr. f. Psych., S. 841, 1905.
- Lomer, Weibliche Trinker und ihre Nachkommenschaft: Pol. Anthr. Rev., 1907.
- A. Lui: Eredità ed Alcolismo. Annali di Neurologia, 18. Napoli, 1900.
- Hermann Lundborg: Ueber Geschlechterforschung und Erblichkeitshygiene. Allgem. Zeitschr. f. Psych., S. 175, 1906. Om släktforskning och ärlighets hygien. Upsala Läkaref. förhandl., 1905. Ref. in Centralbl. f. Nervenheilk. u. Psych., 5, 660, 1906.
- A. McGugan: The importance of heredity as a cause of insanity. Journ. of the Amer. Med. Assoc., Chicago, 38, 371-376, 1902. Heredity and the investigation of insanity. Amer. Med. Philad., 2, 166, 1901.
- P. W. MacDonald: Medico-Psychological Association of Great Britain and Ireland, Presidential address delivered July 25, 1907, by MacDonald. Journ. of Mental Science, 1907, S. 667. Heredity, S. 695.
- C. F. MacDonald: The etiological potency of heredity in mental diseases. Philad., M. J., 8, 739-741, 1901.
- Marandon de Montyel: Prédiposition et causes directes en étiologie mentale. Revue d. Psych., S. 115, 1905.
- Marc: Ueber Familiäres Auftreten der progressiven Paralyse. Allgem. Zeitschr. f. Psych., 61, 5, 660, 1904.
- Marioni: Contributions à l'étude l'hérédité chez les paralytiques généraux. Thèse, 1900.
- G. Mendel: Geisteskrankheiten und Ehe. In: Krankh. u. Ehe (Senator u. Krammer), München, S. 642, 1904.
- L. Merzbacher: Gesetzmässigkeiten in der Vererbung und Verbreitung verschiedener hereditär-familiärer Erkrankungen (mit 19 Fig. u. 2 farb. Tafeln). Archiv f. Rass- u. Ges.-Biol., S. 172-198, 1909.
- Meyer: Die Ursachen der Geisteskrankheiten. Jena, 1907.
- P. J. Moebius: Ueber Entartung. Wiesbaden, 1909, Bergmann.
- G. Mondio: Eredità e degenerazione nello sviluppo della demenza consecutiva ed in quello delle stereotiple riscontrate in essa. Merita la demenza consecutiva un capitolo a sé in nosografia mentale? Rivista mensile di Neuropat. e Psych., No. 4-5, 1900.
- Mönkemöller: Eine Vagabundenfamilie. Arch. f. Kriminalanthropol. 1907.
- F. W. Mott: The hereditary aspects of nervous and mental diseases (Huxley lecture). The Lancet, S. 1057-1064, October 8, 1910.
- Herm. Müller: Einige Beziehungen des Alkoholismus zur Aetologie der Epilepsie. Monatsschr. f. Psych. u. Neurol., 28, Erg. Heft, S. 1, 1910.
- J. F. Munson: The rôle of heredity and other factors in the production of traumatic epilepsy. Epilepsia, vol. 2, 343.
- P. Naecke: Erblichkeit und Prädiposition resp. Degeneration bei der progressiven Paralyse der Irren. Archiv f. Psych., 41, 295-306, 1906. Die Rolle der erblichen Belastung bei der progressiven Paralyse der Irren. Neurol. Centralbl., Nr. 16, 1900. Das prozentual ausgedrückte Heiratsrisiko bez. Ausbruchs und Vererbung von Geistes- und Nervenkrankheiten. Allgem. Zeitschr. f. Psych., 63, 3, u. 4, H., S. 482-505, 1906.
- Naegell-Ackerblom: Medikohistorischer Beitrag zur Frage der erblichen Belastung. Therap. Monatsschr., H. 6, 1907.
- Clem. Neisser: Individualität und Psychose. Vortrag bei der Naturforscherversammlung, 1905.
- Nina-Rodrigues: Atavisme psychique et paranoia. Arch. d'anthrop. crim., Lyon et Paris, 17, 325-355, 1902.
- Heinr. Obersteiner: Zur Frage der hereditären Uebertragbarkeit zierterierter pathologischer Zustände. Neurol. Centralbl., Nr. 11, S. 498, 1900.
- Karl Pearson: On the inheritance of the mental and moral characters in man, and its comparison with the inheritance of the physical characters. Journal of the Anthropological Institute of Great Britain, 33, 179-237, 1903. Inheritance of want of mental balance. Brit. Med. Journ., 1905 (1).
- Peipers, Consanguinität in der Ehe und deren Folgen für die Deszendenz. Allgem. Zeitschr. f. Psych., 58, H. 5, S. 793-862, 1901.
- M. Pelletin: L'hérédité Biologique et l'hérédité psychologique. La Médecine moderne, 1905.
- F. Petró: Della pazzia analogo o gemellare. Annali di freniatria e sc. affini, 20, 142, 1910.
- Pieracini: Ulteriore contributo allo studio delle leggi che regolano la ereditarietà psicopatologica. Rivista sperim. di freniatria, 28, 326-330, Reggio-Emilia, 1902.
- Alexander Pilcz: Beiträge zur Lehre der Heredität. Festschr. z. Feier d. 25 Jahr. Bestandes d. Neurol. Institutes a. d. Wiener Universität, herausg. v. Dr. Otto Marburg, 1. Teil, 1, 282-309. Leipzig u. Wien, 1907.
- Plant und Göring: Untersuchungen an Kinder und Ehegatten von Paralytikern. Münch. med. Wochenschr., S. 1959, 1911.
- P. Rehm: Die Ergebnisse der Untersuchung von Kindern manisch-depressiver Kranker. Zeitschr. f. d. Erforsch. u. Behandl. d. jugendl. Schwachsinn, 3, 1909.
- C. A. Reid: Alcoholism, a study in heredity. London, 1901. Principles of heredity with some applications. London, 1905.
- Eduard Reiss: Konstitutionelle Verstimmung und manisch-depressives Irrensein. Berlin, J. Springer, 1910. Vererbung, S. 255-261.
- F. Ris: Vorstellung von Familiengruppen Geisteskranker. Korrespondenzbl. f. Schweiz. Ärzte, 32, 447-449, Basel, 1902.
- L. S. A. M. Römer: Beiträge zur Erkenntnis des Uranismus. Heft 1: Die uranische Familie, Untersuchungen über die Aszendenz der Uranier. Leipzig, Amsterdam, 107 S., 1906. Die erbliche Belastung des Centralnervensystems bei Uranier, geistigsgesunden Menschen und Geisteskranken. Jahrb. f. sexuelle Zwischenstufen, 7. Jahrg., 1, 67, Leipzig, 1905.
- Hans Roemer: Zur Symptomatologie und Genetologie der psychischen Epilepsie in der epileptischen Anlage. Allgem. Zeitschr. f. Psych., 67, 588-627, 1910. Eine Stammliste aller amtlich bekannt werdenden Fälle von Geisteskrankheit. Psychiatr. Neurol. Wochenschr., 13. Jahrg., 1911, H. 10, S. 94.
- J. Rogue de Fursac: L'hérédité dans l'avarice. Journ. de Psychol. norm. et Pathol., Mai-Juni, 1909.
- Rohde: Das Vererbungsproblem in der Neuro- und Psychopathologie. 79. Versamm. Deutsch. Naturf. u. Ärzte in Dresden vom 15-21 Sept., 1907. Neurol. Centralbl., S. 972, 1907.
- Roubinowitsch et Pulpin: Contribution à l'étiologie du syndrome de la démence précoce. Annales méd-psychol., Juni, 1903.
- J. Roubinowitsch, et Levaditi: Le rôle de la syphilis dans l'étiologie de la démence précoce. Gazette des Hôp., Juni, 1909.
- Riddin, Ergänzende Bemerkungen zu Otto Diems Artikel: Der Psycho-neurotische, erbliche Belastung der Geisteskranken und der Geisteskranken. Archiv f. Rass-Ges.-Biol., 2, 476, 1905.
- Th. Rybakow: Alkoholismus und Erblichkeit. Monatsschr. f. Psych. u. Neurol., 20, Erh.-Heft, S. 221-234, 1906.
- William C. Sandy: Studies in heredity with examples. Amer. Journ. of Insanity, 66, 587-589, 1910.
- Sanger-Brown: Heredity and epilepsy. The Alienist and Neurologist, July, 1901.
- Schloss: Zur Kenntnis der Aetologie der Angeborenen und frühzeitig erworbenen psychischen Defektzustände. Psych.-Neurol. Wochenschr., Nr. 48-50, 1907.
- H. O. Schlub: Ueber Geisteskrankheit bei Geschwistern. Allgem. Zeitschr. f. Psych., 66, 3, u. 4, H., S. 514-541, 1909.
- Schülle: Ueber die Frage des Heiratens von früher Geisteskranken. Leipzig, 1904, S. Hirzel. Ueber die Frage des Heiratens von früher Geisteskranken II. (Geisteskrankheit und Ehe). Anlegung der statistischen Tabellen über Erblichkeit. Klinische und biologische Fragestellungen. Genetologische Stammbäume von 20 Zyklichen Geisteskranken (mit Tabelle). Vorschläge zur Prophylaxe. Mit 11 Tafeln. Berlin, 1905. G. Reimer, 46 S. Nochmals das Heiraten von früher Geisteskranken. Ref. Psych.-Neurol. Wochenschr., Nr. 100, 1904. Vorlage eines Bogens für Feststellung der Erblichkeit. Jahresversamm. d. Deutsch. Vereins f. Psychiatrie in Dresden am 28. u. 29. April, 1905. Neurol. Centralbl., S. 484, 1905.
- Bernard Schwarzwald: De la démence précoce familiale. Thèse de Doctorat, Lausanne. Imprimerie Cosmopolite. Pré-du-Marché 45, 1907.
- René Semelaigne: Family mental diseases. Journ. of Mental Science, S. 159, 1901.
- Max Sichel: Ueber die Geistesstörungen bei den Juden. Neurol. Centralbl., Nr. 8, S. 351, 1908. Der Alkohol als Ursache der Belastung. Neurol. Centralbl., 29, 738-748, 1910.
- Sklarek und van Nieuwen: Gleichzeitige geistige Erkrankung bei 3 Geschwistern. Allgem. Zeitschr. f. Psych., 61, 5.
- R. Sommer: Psychiatrische Untersuchung eines Falles von Mord und Selbstmord mit Studien über Familiengeschichte und Erblichkeit. Sommers Klinik f. psych. u. nervöse Krankh., 1, 1, S. 55. Die Beziehungen zwischen Psychologie, Psychopathologie und Kriminalpsychologie vom Standpunkte der Vererbungslehre. Vortrag, gehalten in der Gesellsch. f. soz. Medizin usw. am 21. Februar, 1909, in Berlin, nebst Diskussion. Bibl. f. soz. Medizin usw., H. 3, Berlin, 1910. Allgem. Verl.-Anstalt., 30 S. Zur Theorie der Verwandtschaften und des Ahnenverlustes bei Menschen und Tieren. 5, 4, H. Halle a. S., 1910. Familienforschung und Vererbungslehre. Leipzig, 1907. Bemerkungen zu einem Fall von erbterbter Sechsigfingrigkeit. 5, 4, H. Halle a. S., 1910. Psychiatrie und Familienforschung. Allgem. Zeitschr. f. Psych., H. 2-3, S. 463, 1907.
- T. E. K. Stansfield: Heredity and Insanity. Journ. of Ment. Sc., January, 1911.
- H. F. Stelzner: Die psychopathische Konstitution und ihre soziologische Bedeutung. Berlin, 1911. S. Karger. Aetiologische Momente, S. 13-74.

W. Strohmayer: Ueber die Bedeutung der Individualstatistik bei der Erblichkeitsfrage in der Neuro- und Psychopathologie. Münch. med. Wochenschr., 48, 1786, 1842. 1901. Die Ahnentafel der Könige Ludwig II. und Otto I. von Bayern. Ein genealogisch-psychiatrischer Deutungsversuch. Archiv. f. Rass.-u. Ges.-Biol., S. 65, 1910. Ueber den Wert Genealogischer Betrachtungsweise in der psychiatrischen Erblichkeitslehre. Monatsschr. f. Psych. u. Neurol., 22, Erg.-Heft, S. 115, 1907 (Festschrift für Otto Binswanger). Zur Kritik der Feststellung und der Bewertung psychoneurotischer erblicher Belastung. Archiv. f. Rass.- u. Ges.-Biol., 5, 478, 1908.

J. F. Sutherland: Recidivism. Part II. Journ. of Mental Science, 1907, S. 588. Heredity, S. 584. Recidivism. Part III. Journ. of Mental Science, 1908, S. 68. Biometrics and National Eugenics, S. 71, Degeneracy, S. 72. Causation of Rec., S. 73.

W. N. Thompson: Heredity and the transmission of the insane diathesis. Vermont M. Month. Burlington, 325-337, 1900. Also Journ. Med. n. Sc. Portland, 7, 337-342, 1900-1901.

W. Tigges: Die Abnormitäten der Aszendenz in Beziehung zur Deszendenz. Allgem. Zeitschr. f. Psych., S. 891, 1907. Die Gefährdung der Nachkommenschaft durch Psychosen, Neurosen und verwandte Zustände der Aszendenz. Allg. Zeitschr. f. Psych., 63, 448-481, 1906. Untersuchungen über die erblich belasteten Geisteskranken. Allgem. Zeitschr. f. Psych., 64, H. 1, S. 47 S., 1907.

Th. Tilling: Individuelle Geistesart und Geistesstörung. Wiesbaden, 1904. Zur Aetiologie der Geistesstörungen. Centralbl. f. Nervenheilk. u. Psych., Sept., S. 561, 1903.

A. F. Tredgold: Remarks on the subsequent history of children born whilst that mother was insane. Lancet, 1, 1380-1385, London, 1902.

Trenel: Maladies mentales familiales. Annales méd-Psychol., Paris, S. 11, 96-107, 1900.

Urquhart: The Morison lectures. On insanity, with special reference to heredity and prognosis. Journ. of Mental Science, April, Nr. 221, S. 233, 1907.

R. Vogt: Om Arvelighed. Separataftryk af Tidsskrift for Nordisk Reitsmedicin og Psykiatri.

Vorster: Ueber die Vererbung endogener Psychosen. Monatsschr. f. Psychontrie, 9, 1901. Zur Erblichen Uebertragung der Geisteskrankheiten. Diskussion. Allgem. Zeitschr. f. Psych., S. 493, 1901.

Voss: Ueber die Bedeutung der Entartung un der Psychiatrie und Neurologie. Verhandl. d. Med. Vereins zu Greifswald, Jahrg., 1909, S. 44, Leipzig, Georg Thieme, 1910. Also, Deutsche med. Wochenschr., 1909-10.

Wagner v. Jauregg: Ueber Erbliche Belastung. Antrittsvorlesung. Wiener Klin. Wochenschr., Nr. 44, 1902. Einiges über erbliche Belastung. Wiener klin. Wochenschr., Nr. 1, 1906.

W. Weinberg: Verwandtenehe und Geisteskrankheit. Archiv. f. Rass.-u. Ges.-Biol., S. 471-475, 1907. Statistik und Vererbung in der Psychiatrie. Klinik. f. psych. u. nervöse Krankh., 5, H. 1, 1910.

J. Wigglesworth: The Presidential Address delivered at the sixty-first annual meeting of the Medico-Psychological Association, held in Liverpool on July 24, 1902. Heredity and Insanity. Journ. of Mental Science, S. 611-645, 1902.

Wille: Ueber Erbliche Uebertragung von Geisteskrankheiten. Korrespondenzbl. f. Schweiz. Ärzte, S. 603, 1902.

R. Wlaskak: Das Problem der Degeneration. Vortrag, gehalten in Akadem. Abstinensverein Wien Aus: Internat. Monatschr. z. Erforsch. d. Alkoholismus n. Bekämpfung. f. Trinksitten. 20. Jahrg., H. 3, März, 1910.

Ryssla, Wolfsohn: Heredität bei Dementia Præcox. Allgem. Zeitschr. f. Psych., 64, 347 ff., 1907.

Frederick Adams Woods: Mental and moral heredity in royalty. A statistical study of history and sociology. New York, 1906. 12, VIII, 312 S. ill.

J. M. S. Word und A. R. Urquhart: A family tree illustrative of insanity and suicide. Journ. of Mental Science, Oktober, S. 764, 1901.

L. Gertrude Cannon, A. M., and J. A. Rosanoff: Preliminary report of a study in insanity in the light of the Mendelian laws. Eugenics Record Office. Bull. No. 3. (Reprint from Journ. Nervous and Mental Disease, vol. 38, No. 5, 1911.)

Charles B. Davenport, H. H. Laughlin, F. David Weeks, E. R. Johnstone, H. Henry Goddard: The Study of Human Heredity. Eugenics Record Office. Bull. No. 2.

C. B. Davenport: The Trait Book. Eugenics Record Office. Bull. No. 6.

C. B. Davenport and F. David Weeks, M. D.: A first study of inheritance in epilepsy. Eugenics Record Office. Bull. No. 4. (Reprint from Journ. Nervous and Mental Disease, vol. 38, No. 11, 1911.)

H. Henry Goddard, Ph. D.: Eugenics Record Office. Heredity of Feeble-mindedness. Bull. No. 1.

F. W. Mott: Inborn Factors of Nervous and Mental Diseases. Brain, Parts II and III, Vol. XXXIV, Nov., 1911.

A. J. Rosanoff, M. D., and I. Florence Orr, B. S.: A study of heredity in insanity in the light of the Mendelian theory. American Journ. of Ins., Vol. LXVIII, No. 2, Oct., 1911. Eugenics Record Office. Bull. No. 5.

E. Rüdin: Wege und Ziele Familienforschung, mit Rücksicht auf die Psychiatrie. Zeitschrift für die Gesamte Neurologie und Psychiatrie, 7 Band, 5 Heft, Nov. 18, 1911.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, some objection is made to going on to-night later than half past 6 o'clock, and if I can have an agreement—I know it has to be taken up in the House—but if I can have an understanding that we will run until 6.30 to-night and then meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow I will state I am willing to make the motion that the committee rise at 6.30, and I would like to know whether there is any objection to that now, because I would not want some gentleman, after we have made that kind of an arrangement, to make objection after we get into the House.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I will state to the gentleman, as far as I am concerned, I have no objection to it, although I announced at the beginning of the session to-day that I would raise the point of no quorum unless there was an arrangement as to how long we would sit.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Pennsylvania rise?

Mr. MOORE. To reserve the right to object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has not submitted a request for unanimous consent. He simply made a statement.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman submitted a statement, and I would like to speak to that just a minute, so that he may hear it. Will it be agreeable to the gentleman to quit at 6 o'clock to-night, in view of the fact that he wants to start an hour earlier to-morrow? Quite a number of gentlemen are anxious to get away to-morrow afternoon, and some have engagements for to-night. We are beyond the usual time for adjourning now. If the gentleman will quit at 6 o'clock, I think there will be no objection to his proposition to resume at 11 in the morning.

Mr. BURNETT. I would not want to do that, because I think we had a tentative agreement to the other effect. That would leave three hours for general debate to-morrow; and if we have this understanding the gentleman need not stay who do not wish to speak. If there is going to be objection, I would run on and try to get a quorum. If there is no objection gentlemen would be at perfect liberty to go on and keep their engagements.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. The rivers and harbors bill is being considered. The committee is sitting and they are going to meet to-morrow morning at half past 10, and I want to be here to listen to this discussion.

Mr. BURNETT. If there is going to be objection, I will withdraw any request and go on.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, before that is done—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the time which is being now consumed is being charged to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT].

Mr. MANN. I think it ought not to be charged to him. It is impossible to reach a unanimous agreement.

The CHAIRMAN. It is impossible for the Committee of the Whole to enter into an agreement.

Mr. MANN. It is possible to consider a unanimous-consent proposition without its being charged to the time of the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. If there is no objection, it will not be charged to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT].

Mr. MOORE. We are trying to come to an understanding, and it seems to me we should know now between the three elements directing the matter in the House how much time has been consumed, and we may be able to formulate our plans for to-morrow.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] has consumed 88 minutes; the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE], 62 minutes; the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] has consumed 45½ minutes—195½ minutes in all.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Chairman, may I suggest to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] that we had better rise?

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ABERCROMBIE], if I can not reach an agreement.

Mr. MANN. Let us see if we can not reach an understanding on this. I hope there may be no objection to meeting at 11 o'clock to-morrow, if we adjourn at 6.30 to-night. I think that is to the convenience of nearly everybody.

Mr. BURNETT. I am willing to do that if gentlemen will indicate that there will be no objection. But as long as men are talking about objecting, I want to go on with the work.

Mr. SABATH. I wish to say, personally, that I have no objection to going on until 6.30, although some gentlemen think we are to adjourn at 6 or soon thereafter. Now, if the gentleman would consume the 15 minutes now, that would bring us until 5 minutes after 6, and then we could rise.

Mr. MANN. Let him put somebody else in.

Mr. SABATH. You have somebody else here?

Mr. BURNETT. Yes.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. BURNETT. I do not yield.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I trust the gentleman will yield, because I can raise a point of no quorum, and I do not desire to do that.

Mr. BURNETT. What does the gentleman suggest, then?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. What I suggest is this: That you will use whatever time you wish up to half past 6, not asking us to use any of our time.

Mr. BURNETT. I will not agree to that. I will agree to use 20 minutes.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. And then rise?

Mr. BURNETT. No, sir. If the gentleman is without speakers, that is a very unjust request.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. But there ought to be plenty in the Chamber.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ABERCROMBIE].

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MURRAY] makes the point of no quorum. The Chair will count.

Mr. MANN. While the Chair is counting a quorum I suggest to all gentlemen that it is better to be good-natured.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, these gentlemen are apparently without speakers to consume the time.

Mr. MANN. That can be easily arranged afterwards. The question is whether we will agree to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. So far as that is concerned, it is a question whether it is more important for me to be here or in the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. But I shall not object to the 11 o'clock arrangement.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Chairman, I shall object to the 11 o'clock arrangement if the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] objects to the proposition I have made, namely, that he use the time and then rise.

Mr. BURNETT. All right. Mr. Chairman, I ask that we go on.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MURRAY] makes the point of no quorum. The Chair will count.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, in view of developments since my suggestion was made, I will withdraw the point of no quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MURRAY] withdraws the point of no quorum.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to my colleague from Alabama [Mr. ABERCROMBIE].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ABERCROMBIE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, in the opinion of many people no subject more important than that of the proper regulation of immigration will come before this Congress. It bears directly or indirectly upon a number of our most difficult problems, among which may be mentioned those of capital and labor, production and consumption, poverty and crime, education and government. In fact, it touches and influences almost every phase of our America life.

#### THE FIRST SETTLERS.

The American continent was settled by members of the Anglo-Saxon race who sought escape from injustice and oppression in other lands—people of intelligence, character, and independence, who were willing to make the sacrifices and undergo the hardships incident to the development of a new country in order that they and their descendants might enjoy the blessings of civil and religious liberty. They came to build homes and establish a civilization. They were possessed of a common purpose, and no racial dissimilarities existed as barriers to easy and complete homogeneity. As a result, though there were differences in language and custom, amalgamation was natural and rapid.

The original settlers came chiefly from Great Britain, Germany, Scandinavia, and other Teutonic countries in northern and western Europe, and those countries furnished a large majority of the newcomers until within the last third of a century. In the beginning nobody dreamed even that there might ever come a time when there would be a great influx of dissimilar and unassimilable peoples.

Then came the unfortunate conflict of the sixties. The country—the whole country—was left in confusion and distress, a third of it in the depths of poverty, darkness, and despair. For the next two or three decades all hands and hearts and minds were turned toward the rehabilitation of personal fortunes and the reconstruction of local, State, and Federal Governments; and almost before it was realized, certainly before it was realized by many, the present tremendous and perplexing problem of immigration confronted the country.

#### RECENT IMMIGRATION.

A wonderful change in the composition of our citizenship as it relates to ethical standards and racial characteristics has taken place during the last third of a century. Within that period immigration from northern and western Europe has grown smaller year by year, while that from southern and eastern European countries has increased until it has reached enormous and bewildering proportions. In its report on this phase of the subject the Immigration Commission of 1907 says:

During the fiscal year 1907, in which the commission was created, a total of 1,285,349 immigrants were admitted to the United States. Of this number 1,199,596 were from Europe, including Turkey in Asia, and of these 971,608, or 81 per cent, came from the southern and

eastern countries, including Austria-Hungary, Bulgaria, Greece, Italy, Montenegro, Poland, Portugal, Roumania, Russia, Servia, Syria, and Turkey.

Twenty-five years earlier, in the fiscal year 1882, 648,764 European and Syrian immigrants came to the United States, and of these only 83,320, or 12.9 per cent, came from the countries above enumerated, while 563,170, or 87.1 per cent, were from Belgium, the British Isles, France, Germany, the Netherlands, Scandinavia, and Switzerland, which countries furnished 95.8 per cent of the total immigration movement from Europe to the United States between 1819 and 1883.

During the entire period for which statistics are available—July 1, 1819, to June 30, 1910—a total of 25,447,180 European immigrants, including 103,747 from Turkey in Asia, were admitted to the United States. Of these, 15,968,689, or 62.8 per cent, came from the northern and western countries enumerated, and 9,478,491, or 37.2 per cent, from southern and eastern Europe and Turkey in Asia.

An average of approximately a million aliens come annually into the United States, more than fourteen hundred thousand coming within the last 12 months. From almost every country in the world they come. Until within a recent period comparatively few of them located in the Southern States, but of recent years they are locating there in increasing numbers. Some of the far Western States are receiving many Asiatics, and as a result that section is threatened with a "yellow peril."

This mad rush of foreigners to our shores is perhaps the most remarkable social and economic phenomenon of the current third of a century; yet few people, even among the most intelligent and observant, have realized the number and the immensity of the problems which it imposes. These problems are at once social and economic, civic and industrial, ethical and racial.

Practically all of the earlier immigrants came of the same race, or branches of the same race, and were therefore easily welded into a homogeneous body, while many of those who are now coming in a mighty stream are dissimilar from the first settlers in race, in language, in customs, in ideals, and in possibilities of development and assimilation. Almost every section now faces a race problem, no two being exactly alike. To complicate the situation, our negro population is increasing rapidly, the number having grown within a half century from four to ten millions, most of whom are located in the same section.

It would seem, therefore, that the problem of the races is sufficiently grave, complicated, and embarrassing without our encouraging the coming of other and differing peoples. [Applause.]

#### COMPLETE ASSIMILATION IMPOSSIBLE.

It has been suggested by certain students of sociology and ethnology that these great and ever-changing multitudes of dissimilar peoples will in the course of time become so intermingled, so completely amalgamated, as to form a new and distinct race which will supplant the original Anglo-Saxon stock and be superior to any one of the component races. Few of us are ready to believe that such a result is possible; fewer still that it is probable. All ethnologic history teaches the contrary. No hybrid or mongrel people has ever excelled or equaled the superior of the species involved in its production. [Applause.]

But when we take into consideration the tremendous influx of newcomers whose birth rate is large, the constantly and rapidly increasing negro population, and the declining birth rate among native Americans of Anglo-Saxon origin, there seems to be reason for the fear that the time may come when this country will be made up, if not of a mongrel race, then of groups of peoples of dissimilar races and nationalities. In fact, this is true to-day in a number of the large cities.

In some sections, especially in the larger cities, the problem of the immigrant is almost as perplexing as is the race problem of the Southern States. Indeed, it is believed by some to be a problem more difficult of solution, for in the South we have solved our problem, partially at least, by decreeing that there shall be no blood amalgamation. [Applause.]

#### SOME ASPECTS OF THE PROBLEM.

Among the more interesting and at the same time the more discouraging aspects of the immigrant problem may be mentioned the following:

1. The already large and rapidly increasing number. At the present rate of increase the time is not far distant when each State and each community in each State will have in its midst many aliens, a large percentage of whom have no regard for our institutions, no appreciation of our civic and ethical ideals, and no desire to become American citizens.

2. The character of the immigrant. Many are steeped in ignorance and superstition, undeveloped morally and physically, victims of disease—characterless, moneyless, and criminal. Of course, this is not true of all; we know that certain classes of immigrants are intelligent and well developed physically, mentally, and morally.

3. Their tendency toward clannishness. Large sections of our great cities have already been given over to them almost completely. I recall no large city in the entire country that has not its foreign element and its foreign section. This makes the administration of government more difficult and more expensive.

4. Their low standards of living. Oppressed for ages, accustomed to the weakening and degrading standards of overpopulated countries, inured to the restrictions and hardships of poverty, thousands of them are able to exist upon smaller wages than our native people require. The result is that our natives can not live comfortably and contentedly in competition with them. This develops prejudice and friction; tends to lower our own standards of living; swells the number of the unemployed; aggravates the differences between capital and labor; and creates numerous civic, social, and economic problems.

5. Their racial characteristics. The color of thousands of them differs materially from that of the Anglo-Saxon, and with other racial characteristics constitutes a standing barrier to that homogeneity so essential in a democracy. The highest form of democracy can not exist where the citizenship is made up of races that for ethnological reasons can not blend without the deterioration of the superior race. Wherever the Caucasian and other races have existed upon the same soil there have been great and unavoidable antagonisms.

#### IMMIGRATION IMPOSES MIGHTY OBLIGATION.

Upon all who value the privileges and appreciate the duties of citizenship, the problem of immigration imposes a tremendous obligation. Upon Members of Congress, especially, the obligation rests most heavily. It is our bounden duty to seek a solution. Wherein lies that solution? If to be found anywhere, I believe, with the Immigration Commission and with the Committee on Immigration, that the best immediately available solution will be found in restriction, distribution, and education, and that, under existing conditions, the educational test should be applied, at least temporarily and in moderation, at the very threshold. [Applause.]

The bill under consideration seeks to minimize the number of immigrants by adding to the excludable list those over 16 years of age who are unable to read some language or dialect, upon the idea that this plan offers the most effective method of further restricting the admission of those who are most likely to make undesirable citizens or residents. Since ignorance and idleness, illiteracy and weakness, shiftlessness and inefficiency, pauperism and criminality usually go hand in hand, we can not admit large numbers possessing these characteristics without endangering American institutions, without jeopardizing democratic ideals. [Applause.]

It is but natural that those whose ability to continue to reap enormous and unearned profits depends upon an unlimited supply of the cheapest and most servile of alien labor should object to anything that would tend to diminish that supply.

#### EDUCATION OF IMMIGRANT.

But our duty does not end with the admission of the immigrant. As far as it is possible under nature's limitations we should encourage his assimilation. If we can not take the immigrant into our homes, we can assist him in building homes of his own; if we can not in safety mingle our blood with his, we can encourage him to protect his own blood; if we can not admit him to our schools, we can aid him in conducting schools for himself; if we can not at once clothe him with citizenship, we can teach him the principles of democracy; if he will not accept our civilization forthwith, we can by precept and example lead him gradually to appreciate its beauties. In other words, we can educate him. Indeed, outside of the processes of education there is no permanent solution to any problem. The immigrant and immigrant's child, as well as the native and the native's child, must be instructed in the history, the theories, the practices, and the ideals of Americanism. [Applause.]

The first step in this education will be to instruct in the use of our language. With the parents this process will be slow and in many cases unsatisfactory. With their children it will be rapid and more satisfactory. Having taught the immigrant and his child the use of the means of communication, the other processes will follow with less of effort.

In this education, where the number of immigrants is smaller than the native population and there is no great racial dissimilarity, the ordinary public schools may be employed; but in the beginning it may be necessary to establish special schools with specially trained teachers. In communities made up wholly or almost wholly of illiterate immigrants teachers should be selected from those races which predominate in numbers, and such teachers should be trained by native instructors.

It will be necessary in many places to utilize the night school, since the parents and many of the children will probably find

it necessary to work during the daytime. Indeed, in many localities the natives as well as the foreigners can best be reached with education in night classes. That this is true has been demonstrated by the Young Men's Christian Association.

Again, in the education of the immigrant and his child the vocational or trade school can be made an effective agency. Too many of our people, both native and foreign born, grow into manhood and womanhood without the training necessary for a successful performance of life's everyday duties. Vocational education, training for productivity and self-support, is one of our greatest social, civic, and economic needs, and this form of education can not be omitted in the adequate preparation of the newcomer for life in our land. [Applause.]

Along with the education of the immigrant should go also organized and cooperative efforts upon the part of local, State, and Federal Governments to assist him in securing honorable and lucrative employment. We should see to it that he receives wages that will enable him and his family to live on a standard not far below that of the natives of the same class and occupation. To that end immigrants should be discouraged from isolating themselves and settling in communities made up entirely of foreigners.

The problem of the immigrant, like the problem of the negro, would be less difficult if the immigrant population could be distributed more evenly throughout the country. It is perfectly natural for newcomers, if left to themselves, to congregate in isolated localities. This is shown by the fact that large sections of our great cities have been monopolized by them.

If a large portion of those who come to us from other countries come with low standards of living and low ethical ideals, it is because they have been neglected and oppressed in the countries from which they come; and that fact only makes our duty all the plainer, all the more binding. We are our brother's keeper, and our brother is our fellow man wherever he may be found. [Applause.]

#### THE PUBLIC SCHOOL.

That American institution which promises to play a greater part than any other in the solution of the problem of the immigrant is the public school. Universal education of the right kind in free government works wondrous changes. The question is whether this agency is so organized and administered as to meet the requirements of the situation. Has there been a serious and effective effort to adapt the school system to the needs of the immigrant child?

This question as it relates to the entire country must be answered in the negative. It is stated that the reformatories of the country are the recipients of a large number of immigrant children; that the number is greatly disproportionate to the percentage of immigrant population. It is stated also that the percentage of immigrant criminals, youthful and adult, is far greater in proportion to population than that of native citizens.

If these statements be true, may not these conditions come from ignorance of laws and customs rather than from moral turpitude? In either case can there be a remedy quite so efficacious as the influence of the public school?

#### CONCLUSION.

After all, no man can tell what is to be the result of our efforts to assimilate the millions who are flocking to our shores; that is known only to the Most High. But this we do know—that he who serves fellow man aright serves self and home and country and God.

In this faith let us indulge the hope that the time will come when all the people of our glorious country, both native and foreign born, will be intelligent, educated, moral, law-abiding, prosperous, and happy; when the proudest boast of each will be, "I am an American citizen." [Applause.]

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY] is recognized.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, having the honor of representing the greatest industrial district in the United States, I have gone into this question to the very best of my ability, and I may say that I am firmly convinced that the best interests of those communities that make up the industrial centers of this country demand the passage of this bill.

I shall vote for this bill because I believe it means the best interests, not only of America as a Nation, but of the immigrants themselves, those who are already here and those who, unless immigration is restricted, would continue coming to our shores in great numbers.

This last phase is one which is seldom, if ever, considered, but I maintain that it is most important. By the very force of numbers, passing the bounds of assimilation, the illiterate and ignorant immigrant, does not and can not secure a fair chance

here, nor can his treatment square with the demands of common justice.

The illiterate immigrant is the victim of unscrupulous rascality from the time he leaves his cottage home in the Old World until he becomes part of the human maelstrom in our great industrial centers, where the vast majority of these newcomers finally gravitate.

Evil seduction awaits him on every hand. He is misdirected, cheated, and deceived at every turn. He is preyed upon by the extortioner and the grafter; he is despoiled by the faker. Crooked officers of the law trap him for fines, and he is the helpless victim of countless indignities, while he is surrounded by every kind of evil and cut off from every influence for good.

I have seen these conditions at first hand, but if anyone should think that I am dealing in exaggeration, I would refer him to the summary of the annual report of the bureau of industries and immigration of New York State for the year ending September 30, 1911. It is as follows:

In the matter of distribution of labor, that this State is without any machinery for distribution or supervision of private distribution agencies, except through a law administered by separate cities according to the standard and belief of each individual mayor, although a great part of the furnishing of labor is intercity and interstate.

In the matter of transportation, that the combination of steamship agents, emigrant hotels, runners, porters, expressmen, and cabmen throughout the country, operating chiefly through New York City, forms one of the most stupendous systems for fleecing the alien from the time he leaves his home country until he reaches his destination in America, and vice versa.

In the matter of living and labor conditions in labor camps and colonies, that aliens are discriminated against in regard to housing, sanitation, food supplies, and employment methods, being denied the ordinary decencies of life; that in regard to labor conditions, aliens are checked and tagged, amounts ordered by the padroni are deducted from their wages without their knowledge or express sanction, and exploitations occur in hospital charges and the purchase of supplies.

In the matter of industrial calamities and personal injuries, exploitation by lawyers and their runners and claim agents and collection agents bear heavily on the alien because of his alienage and international complications with his family and property in his home country.

In the matter of savings, that the private banking laws are affording only a small measure of protection, owing to evasions of the law, and no protection whatever outside of cities of the first class; that frauds in the sale of homes to aliens by means of the solving of puzzles or by means of excursions arranged to interest aliens in "show" pieces of property, or by other means, are widespread; and that the settlement of affairs in the old country, when an alien wishes to settle here, is in the hands of a most unscrupulous class of lawyers, notaries public, collection agents, information bureaus, and protective leagues.

In the matter of education for children, that inadequate provisions exist for taking care of groups of people who collect with the starting of new industries in remote places, such as mines and quarries, and that adults outside of cities are wholly neglected in matters of instruction in English, civics, and naturalization. There are no systematic assimilation processes by the State and cities under way except in the largest cities.

Such an indictment—and no one acquainted with actual conditions can doubt its accuracy—proves that the glorious opportunities for the oppressed of other lands are largely composed of the shimmering fabric of which dreams are made.

Not only that, but after he has secured employment the illiterate foreigner is under a handicap not only discouraging but deadly. Pennsylvania's record can be used here, for no other State receives more of the lowest class of immigrants than that great industrial Commonwealth. And I contend that that record shows that there is a very vital and very real connection between the ignorance betokened by illiteracy and the gory death and accident tolls of industry.

Every year 45,000 able-bodied workers are sent to the surgeon or the undertaker as the result of accidents while at their daily occupations in the mines and mills and factories of Pennsylvania. It is a fearful waste of life and limb, and every accident entails suffering and privation not only for the victim himself but for his helpless dependents. Still, of all the myriad industries of the Keystone State there is but one which demands that the worker knowingly take his life in his hand every time he enters the plant—that is the manufacture of dynamite, blasting powder, and high explosives. Death is always at the side of the worker in this industry, and his grim shadow is ever at hand. In that industry in Pennsylvania, according to the report of the Secretary of Internal Affairs at hand, there are 740 persons employed—553 Americans and 108 foreigners, a preponderance of Americans found in but few industries of the State.

In this deadly occupation the year's accident toll is three, one fatal and two nonfatal.

The same report shows that making iron and steel and cement and mining bituminous and anthracite coal are more hazardous occupations by far than making dynamite. The reason is not hard to find to anyone who will go through the statistics of the report, for it stands out so vividly that all who run may read.

In these other industries mentioned a large majority of the employees are of the lowest and most ignorant class. In the pig-iron industry 4,997 Americans are employed and 8,290 for-

eigners. A year's record shows 42 fatal accidents and 1,994 nonfatal.

In the steel works that have rolling mills and make a finished product 22,421 Americans are employed and 30,331 foreigners. The death toll for a year is 166, with 10,200 nonfatal injuries.

In the bituminous coal industry 45,531 Americans are employed and 107,728 foreigners. There are 449 fatal accidents a year and 4,151 nonfatal.

In the anthracite coal industry 51,567 Americans and 86,105 foreigners are employed. The accident report shows 539 fatal and 3,360 nonfatal in a year.

In the cement industry 3,598 Americans are employed and 5,928 foreigners. Twenty-three workers are killed in a year and 435 are seriously but not fatally injured.

In other words, only 1 out of every 740 employees of dynamite factories loses life as a result of the risk of the industry, and 1 out of 370 employees is injured, while in the mining of anthracite coal 1 of every 255 workers is killed and 1 of every 41 is injured every year. In the mining of bituminous coal 1 of every 340 workers is killed and 1 of every 36 injured. In the cement industry 1 of every 414 workers is killed and 1 of every 22 is injured. In the pig-iron industry 1 of every 316 workers is killed and 1 of every 7 is injured. In the steel industry 1 of every 310 workers is killed and 1 of every 5 is injured.

Wherever the ignorant and illiterate aliens outnumber the Americans in an industry you will read the sure result in the ghastly records of the carnage of peace. The toll is greater in four years of industrial record than in four years of the fratricidal strife of the sixties. I claim that much of this frightful waste of life and limb is due to the ignorance of the foreigners, and they pay the red penalty of their ignorance to the full degree. They suffer in themselves, and they also brand America as a Nation where no regard is paid to humanity in industry and where human life is the cheapest commodity of them all.

The secretary of internal affairs of Pennsylvania recognizes that fact and states it in the report to the Bureau of Industrial Statistics, published in 1911. He has the following to say on the subject:

Notwithstanding all the laws safeguarding employees in the mining industry, too many needless accidents continue to occur. These, to a large degree, are due to the employment of inexperienced foreigners, who neither speak nor understand the English language, and consequently, through ignorance, many become maimed or lose their lives. Of the 86,105 foreigners employed in anthracite mining a majority never saw a coal mine before landing in this country, hence it is not a strange thing that they place in jeopardy their own and coworkers' lives. The mine law requires two years' experience as a miner or miner's laborer before being granted a certificate by the examining board, but many of the men hold certificates obtained through fraud or transferred to them by their compatriots upon returning to their native land.

If his deduction is true regarding an industry where the law requires experience, what must be said of industries where no such requirement is made.

I hold it true that, viewed from the standpoint of the immigrant, his illiteracy and the ignorance and untrained mind it betokens means danger to himself. He is responsible for the application to humanity of the commercial formula that the greatest efficiency is reached by working every machine to the utmost and then throwing it on the scrap heap. The railroad expert says that is true of the locomotive, and though it breaks down in a short time, it is not sent to the repair shop, but to the scrap heap, because it is found that replacement is cheaper than repair.

That is the system of modern commercialism, which is as hard as adamant and as cold as the polar ice. It demands the maximum of product for the minimum of outlay. It takes new, young human engines, works them to the breaking point, and then throws them on the scrap heap. They start in young and vigorous and strong, but the fires burn down, their running record falls, and their usefulness is declared at an end. The scrap heap is always in sight and there are always men who clamor for the places left vacant.

That is the real reason for many of the crying evils of industry, to remedy which legislation has been passed or is proposed. We have heard of the blacklist, and it has been one of the most feared and hated powers of employing corporations. But the blacklist possesses terrors simply because there are more men than jobs. Men fear it because industrial opportunities are few compared with the number of men seeking them.

If there were not an army of laborers begging for jobs the blacklist would be a joke instead of a tragedy.

There is the injunction question which is to be brought to an issue before us soon in bills introduced in both bodies of Congress. I am unhesitatingly in favor of them, for I believe that they seek to solve a great, vexing problem and remedy a vital wrong—the law being made strong to punish the weak and weak to punish the strong.

But I insist that there would be no need for anti-injunction laws were it not for the oversupply of labor caused largely by unrestricted immigration and the lack of opportunities caused by social injustice. Under present conditions an industrial plant is picketed because the strikers want their jobs back and because other men are anxious to fill their places at any wage. If jobs were plentiful, the workers would not need to make an effort to secure employment in a plant where conditions compelled a strike. On the other hand, employers would be forced to make terms fair enough to induce the workers to return.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that this question of immigration is one of the most far-reaching problems now confronting the American people. It is at once a political, financial, industrial, economic, educational, social, and religious problem. It has to do with all these industrial phases I have mentioned, and it is interwoven in that preeminent problem of all, the high cost of living.

We hear economists declare that the production of food is not keeping pace with the demand; that the trend of population is to the cities; and that the food producers must supply the necessities of life for an ever-increasing contingent of food consumers.

That this is true none can doubt, but the fact is sometimes overlooked that of the millions of low-type Europeans and Eurasians coming into this country every year, less than 1 per cent become agriculturists and help to produce food supplies. Ninety-nine per cent go to the crowded centers of population and add to the demand without adding to the supply. Prof. Ross, of the University of Wisconsin, gives the figures for this view as follows:

Between 1900 and 1910, although population grew 21 per cent, the output of the 10 principal crops of the country increased only 9 per cent. Between 1899 and 1911 the value of an average acre's output of such crops increased 70 per cent, while its power to purchase the things the farmer buys was greater by 42 per cent.

There has been a general upheaval of price, to be sure, but the price of farm produce has risen much faster and further than the price of other commodities. This is "the high cost of living," and it is immigration that has made this imp shoot up faster in the United States than anywhere else.

As long as good land lasted our Government stimulated agriculture by presenting a quarter section to whoever would undertake to farm wild land. This bounty overdid farming, until, in the middle of the nineties, the cost of living had reached a minimum.

With the ending of free land, the upward turn was bound to come, but the change was made more dramatic by the inpouring of 10,000,000 of immigrants without the knowledge, the means, or the inclination to engage in farming.

Among us there is 1 American white farmer for 14 American whites, 1 Scandinavian farmer for 8 Scandinavians, 1 German farmer for 11 Germans, 1 Irish farmer for 40 Irish; but it takes 130 Poles, Hungarians, or Italians in this country to furnish 1 farmer.

Falling to contribute their due quota to the production of food, these late comers have ruptured the equilibrium between field and mill and made the high cost of living a burning question.

Mr. Chairman, aside from these industrial and economic phases, I maintain that when a great and increasing infusion of new blood into the American Commonwealth is taking place we have a right and it is our duty to ask, "What will be the effect of this new blood upon the character of America?"

It is our duty to set a standard deemed desirable and then shape our policy so that that standard may be best maintained. If we are to have real patriotism and love of country in this Nation, it must be a matter of pride to say, "I am an American." It seems to me that we must all agree that any standard deemed desirable must have at least the component parts of self-government, social morality, and love of law and order. This Nation is based on the principle of self-government, is dedicated to the proposition that the will of the people is supreme. Public opinion in the last analysis must be the arbiter of our destinies. And public opinion is but the union of private opinions into one composite decision.

Therefore it is of the most vital importance that public opinion be enlightened so that its decisions be just and right. It is in recognition of that fact that our public-school system has been established. Our Government, State and National, spends millions of dollars every year for purposes of education. Why? Simply because it is absolutely necessary for the safety and perpetuity of free institutions and our form of government. Self-government is impossible without self-governing individuals, and you can not have self-governing individuals without training and education. That is why enormous sums are spent for education, with compulsory-attendance laws and burdens willingly borne by taxpayers. It is because it is an admitted fact that the safety and perpetuity of our institutions depend upon the measure of the intelligence of the people.

The State of Pennsylvania spends \$1,000 for every boy or girl who goes through its public schools. Yet in spite of that policy, made necessary for the sake of safety, it has been forced by national action to admit hundreds of thousands of aliens every year who have had little or no knowledge of our freedom

and form of government and no training whatever for the exercise of the responsibilities of citizenship. Is that not a contradiction in policy, and does it not fly in the face of our educational history?

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the hope of our Nation lies in the "little red schoolhouse." I mean by that our public-school system, which has been the nursery of patriots and the protection of our heritage. I hope that every arm outstretched against it may be palsied and every tongue opposing it may be withered, for the time of its destruction marks the downfall of the Republic, with its pillars toppled into wreck and rubbish.

I have no bitterness in my heart against the people of other lands, and I would take no jot nor tittle away from the meed of gratitude we owe those who have come to our shores in the past and whose names have added luster to our history. But they deserve our gratitude simply because they did well their duty in every testing time. They would ask us to do ours now could they express their desire. I take it that our most sacred duty to-day is to protect those ideals for which they fought and labored, to maintain American standards and hold them secure for coming generations.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. QUIN].

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I am not unmindful of what this bill means, and I feel that in advocating it I am advocating principles that will protect the generations of the United States that are yet unborn. I believe that this Government has waited too long to pass a bill like this. For my part it is not far-reaching enough in its scope. I do not believe that any man ought to be admitted into the United States who is not familiar with our Government, who has not all the elements of patriotism in his heart. I think that none except white people ought to be allowed to come into this Republic. I do not believe that all the population of southern Europe that is overrunning this Republic ought to be permitted to come into this country. I do not believe that this great Government ought to allow its institutions to be undermined by the foreigners who have brought anarchy into this country. I can not conceive of this Republic, having been fought for and having been preserved as it was, now being made an asylum for the people across the ocean.

All of the land in this country should be preserved for the Americans. I believe in America for Americans. This country is big enough for us now and it will be big enough for 50 or 100 years to come, but if you permit more than fourteen hundred thousand aliens to come in here every year, what can we expect? We know that these great corporations and syndicates have been bringing in hundreds of thousands of foreigners for the purpose of making labor cheap.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIN. Yes.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. When the gentleman said that he believed in the maxim of America for Americans, did he mean to have us understand that he is opposed to all foreign immigration?

Mr. QUIN. There are classes of people I do not object to coming into this country. My own people came here from Ireland, and I would love to see good Irishmen and good Germans and good Scandinavians come into this country now. Where you see an Irishman you see an honest man. [Laughter.] Where you see a Scandinavian you see a good citizen, and where you see a German you see a good citizen, but by this indiscriminate method of permitting immigration to come into this country you have admitted vampires to our citizenship.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIN. I can not yield any further. I have only 15 minutes. I wish to say to you gentlemen that the time is at hand for us to shut down on the foreign immigration that comes into this country. You talk about the literacy test. I can not conceive of that test being sufficient. This bill does not go far enough as it is. Can we expect to maintain this country if we propose to admit 1,400,000 people to come in here every year? Where will we be? We now have 100,000,000 people in the United States, and every year that you bring in 500,000 from the Mediterranean, like you have dumped on us within the last 12 months, you are bringing into the community something that is bound to have a bad effect. These people do not go out on the farms and produce anything for the people of this country; they are congested in the towns and cities. You have the banana peddlers and you have people sowing the seeds of discord, and as long as that is the case so long will you continue to undermine the real prosperity of your country. What idle labor we have in this country now is enough for us. Why should we continue to let those people in here by the hundreds of thousands, yea, millions?

Some gentleman on this floor has stated that more than 600,000 came into this Republic within the last four months. Why should the American citizens having homes be put in competition with the foreigner brought in here to work in the factories and the mines? Why should our labor be put in competition with such people? Why should the American boy laborer be driven out of his work because of the cheap pauper labor brought over here from Europe and the Orient? That is one of the things that is confronting us; but, my friends, there is a deeper reason for which I oppose the foreign immigration into this country.

I think it is time for us to call a halt. My principal reason is because the bringing in here of the class of citizens who do not love the American flag and who do not have the patriotism that would lead them to defend the country in time of war will, in the course of time, undermine our Government, overthrow our ideals, destroy American institutions, and kill prosperity. They are not the men that come up with intelligent patriotic ideas and vote for honest, high-minded American citizens to be placed in office. They are not men to make the country. They do not build up; they only tear down. These are the men that come to follow the red flag of anarchy and all the "isms" that come from across the sea. I believe in the doctrine of heredity, and when these people have been downtrodden for thousands of years they come into this country bringing their ideas of war on the Government. You can not change one of them in 12 months. Of course there are some good ones from all countries, but we know there are too many bad ones. It is going to affect the environment in which he lives. That bad man is going to spread a cancerous doctrine in the neighborhood where he lives. That is one reason why the United States Government ought to put the bars up against this immigration.

We have had enough trouble in this country already. Do you think all these great riots and troubles have been brought on as a rule by native citizens? It is not the Irishman, it is not the Scandinavian, it is not the German that is doing all this. Read the daily newspapers, read the history of these troubles. Go read who it is that stirs up all these riots, and you will find that it is the foreigner that comes in bearing the seeds of discord and anarchy. It is our duty to protect the people of this country, to protect America against this class of immigration flocking in here in the way and in the manner that it has been coming.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIN. I have not the time. I have only 15 minutes.

Mr. SABATH. Has the gentleman any immigration in his district?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Chairman, I have said to this House, and I say it again, that whenever any country the size of the United States, with a hundred million people under her form of government, under her institutions, permits the indiscriminate foreign element to come into the country, though some of it is all right, while the bulk of it is too much for us, that government makes a mistake. The Government of the United States can not stand it. The United States has been the melting pot of the whole world, civilized and uncivilized. We have let Chinamen and Japanese into this country, and I hope, by the eternals, there never will be another yellow man allowed to come into this country. The time has come when we can not any longer melt them. The United States can not assimilate all of that element. In my country, when a man eats too much raw turnips and raw potatoes, he is likely to have the colic.

The United States has had so much of this scum that we have a bad case of colic, and I want to say that if you permit it to go longer you will have acute indigestion. The Government must belch, and where is it going to belch them? You can not get rid of them after they are once here. Who that loves his country can sit here as a representative of the people and allow this land to be flooded by imbeciles, criminals, lunatics, and diseased people from the Orient and Continental Europe? They are brought in here by these great steamship companies and corporations for the purpose of lowering wages. These men concentrate in the mines, in the railroad shops, and in the factories, and in the cities of this country, and they have a standard of their own as a rule which is lower than the American standard, and instead of elevating society and building up the institutions of a community they lower the standard. Forty per cent of their earnings is sent across the seas, never again to be seen in the United States. Our gold is going across the Atlantic Ocean, not so much to buy goods as it is being sent there to bring more foreigners here or to support them across the water. I do not say that in any prejudiced spirit. I can not do that, because my own forbears were foreigners.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Will the gentleman yield for a question right there?

Mr. QUIN. The gentleman will please excuse me; I have not the time. My own great-grandfather was married in Ireland.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. QUIN. When he came to this country he came at a time when young America needed settlers. He came at a time when America could assimilate immigration. Those were the men who came and helped to make our country, but many of those who come now are coming with environments and habits which instead of building up are tearing down. Why should this Congress be called upon to say that we will let them continue to come? You gentlemen that say we ought not to put the literacy test in this bill ought to consider the future. Our conduct and votes here are for future generations as well as the present. Many men who are ignorant, who can not read or write, are good citizens. I know there are more great rascals as a rule among the educated classes that come to this country than there are among the average citizens of America; but the plain fellow that can not read or write, the real ignorant oriental or European who associates with the bad element, is liable to be worse than the one who can read and write. We know that is true. Every man who knows conditions does not have to be a philosopher to understand that principle, and that is one of the reasons why the literacy test is put in the bill. It is necessary. It is not the best test in the world, and should not be the only one, but this committee has done the best that it could, and I certainly as a citizen of this country and a Member of Congress appreciate the faithful work of that committee.

Some say that Presidents have vetoed bills like this before. It matters not what Presidents have done in the past. We have a President in the White House now who will never veto this bill. He is a statesman who understands the needs of this Government. He understands we are up against a proposition that the Government was not up against when Mr. Cleveland was President. He understands that if we are going to maintain our institutions, and if this flag is to continue to float over this Capitol, a representative government that stands for the people, that something must be done to prohibit this indiscriminate foreign element coming into this Republic as they now come. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object at this point, I simply want to suggest that in all probability experience will teach my friend to be courteous enough in the future to yield.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I object to that kind of statement.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I do not object to his extension of remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and Mr. FOSTER having assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. HAY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 6060, the immigration bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### TIME OF MEETING TO-MORROW.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow morning.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, may I inquire of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] what his plans are about the time for a vote on this bill?

Mr. BURNETT. I have no idea how long it will take to consider it under the five-minute rule.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. Is it the purpose of the gentleman to conclude debate to-morrow night in regard to this measure?

Mr. BURNETT. I would like to do so, if possible.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. I would like to ask the gentleman if he believes it is possible?

Mr. BURNETT. I do not know; the gentleman knows as much as I do.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. Unless some good reason—

Mr. BURNETT. Does the gentleman refer to general debate? Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. Oh, no; I am referring to the matter of when the gentleman thinks will be the probable time for taking the vote according to his idea. Of course, he has some idea.

Mr. BURNETT. I hope to take the vote to-morrow night, if possible; I do not know whether I can or not.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, those of us who are opposed to this bill do not think there is any such emergency as to warrant this unusual request.

Mr. BURNETT. Is the gentleman objecting, after what we agreed to earlier?

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. No; I am discussing it and endeavoring to find out whether there is some good reason for this request.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I make the request.

Mr. MANN. The real reason is that it is a gentleman's agreement. I think the gentleman was here, and I do not see why he should object—

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. I have not said I would.

Mr. MANN. We all understood everybody had agreed to it. Perhaps, inadvertently on our part, we did not catch the gentleman, but it was considered a gentleman's agreement.

Mr. GARDNER. I will say to the gentleman from Massachusetts, judging from what experience I have had in dealing with immigration matters, it will be an absolute impossibility to get through this bill under the five-minute rule to-morrow. That would be my guess. Even if we sat until midnight, I doubt if we could do it, unless the House of Representatives has very much changed in its nature.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. I believe there are some men who may be absent, through no fault of theirs.

Mr. GARDNER. And I should judge this would go over until Monday.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. I am frank to say I realize the improbability of defeating this legislation, but I hope to prevent its ultimate passage by the failure to get two-thirds of the Members of this House in favor of it on a record vote. I am frank to admit my position. I am hoping that, even if it gets to the White House, the bill will be returned to us and will not finally pass. I shall not object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the gentleman from Alabama: Whether under the five-minute rule he proposes to move to close debate on the important sections of the bill under consideration to-day?

Mr. BURNETT. That will depend upon how long the debate would run. I make no promises whatever in regard to that, because if I felt that it was running more time than it ought to I would certainly do so.

Mr. CANTOR. The reason I asked that is there are quite a number of gentlemen who desire to be heard under the five-minute rule; and, while the time may seem an unreasonable length of time to the gentleman from Alabama, it may seem very reasonable to the gentlemen who desire to discuss this question upon its merits. Some of the sections are considered of vital importance. That is the reason why I am asking whether the gentleman from Alabama would move to close debate.

Mr. MANN. I will say to my friend from New York it is impossible for a gentleman in charge of a bill of this sort to state how long he will give for discussion. It will be absolutely impossible for the gentleman from Alabama to press the bill through in a hurry, because it has too long and too many sections in it which give opportunity for filibuster, if both sides were not fair, and the only way to do that is for both sides to be fair.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, there is no intention on the part of our side, if I may use that term, to filibuster on this bill, but we wish to consider it frankly on its merits. There are Members of the House who would like to speak for five minutes on one or two of these sections—how many I do not know—and I hope the gentleman from Alabama will not move to close debate before they have a chance to be heard. That is the only object of my inquiry.

Mr. HAYES. I want to say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CANTOR] that we have had similar bills up here before, and I think nobody will charge the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] with being unreasonable. He has always been fair; and I have no doubt he will still be fair to the gentleman from New York and everybody else in connection with the bill.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. It is true he has not lost any speed.

Mr. BURNETT. But it is true that I have been interrupted at times.

Mr. MOORE. Merely to cater to the convenience of a number of the Members, will the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] say whether he proposes to press the bill after 6 o'clock to-morrow, Saturday, night?

Mr. BURNETT. I can not say about that.

Mr. MOORE. There can be no understanding about that now?

Mr. BURNETT. No.

Mr. MOORE. So every Member will have to take notice?

Mr. BURNETT. If I thought we were approaching the close of the bill, and that we could close it to-morrow night, I certainly would press it.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman, I think, realizes the fact that it will be absolutely impossible to get through with the bill by 6 o'clock to-morrow, no matter how speedily we may proceed. Now, there are many gentlemen here who would like to go home to-morrow afternoon or to-morrow evening without losing the privilege or opportunity of voting against the bill. Now, is it not possible for us to enter into some arrangement or agreement whereby we could adjourn to-morrow at 6 o'clock? We can not finish the bill to-morrow if we stay here until 10 o'clock.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. I wish to say to the gentleman that there are some of us who live at a distance and can not go home Saturday night, but who are interested in expediting the business of Congress.

Mr. SABATH. Well, that does not apply only to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CANTOR. I would like to suggest to the gentleman from Alabama that he take a vote on this bill immediately after the reading of the Journal on Monday.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. My record will show, I think, that I have been as interested in matters of labor as any other Member of Congress, in spite of the remarks of my friend.

Mr. SABATH. I assure you I did not wish to reflect upon his labors in the interest of labor. I wish to say that my record will also disclose that I have been interested in such matters.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT]?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

Mr. BURNETT. I move to adjourn.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. A parliamentary inquiry. What is the parliamentary status?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That when the House adjourns to-night it meet to adjourn at 11 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I reserved the right to object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair did not understand that the gentleman reserved the right to object.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I did. I wish to ask the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] whether in view of the fact that a great many gentlemen desire to be here when the vote is taken and can not very well be here to-morrow evening and remain here until midnight, he will not make some arrangement now by which, if the bill is not concluded in the committee by a certain hour, we shall rise? Now, let the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] name the hour.

Mr. MANN. Let me make a suggestion to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I am opposed to the bill, as the gentleman is. But that is a request that seems to me to be unreasonable on a bill of 60 pages long or thereabouts. The gentleman can not say what the status will be.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. No.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman from New York were in charge of this bill and at 5 or 6 o'clock to-morrow afternoon it looked as though we could finish the bill by 8 o'clock, he would say, "Let us stay and finish it," and would insist upon it. No man can tell. After we have been running under the five-minute rule to-morrow it is likely—I will not say probable—that we can reach an agreement as to the time of adjournment. But the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] can not tell now, and it is his duty to press the bill to its passage.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. If the gentleman from Illinois will understand me, what I am trying to say about that is that if we should be held here until a later hour, 9 or 10 o'clock to-night, and then find that we must come back again on Monday morning, it would be very disagreeable. I am not speaking for myself at all. I am unselfish in this matter.

Mr. MANN. Well, the gentleman is only in the position that I have been in myself. I am in the minority, too.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. There can be no agreement now that the House shall not vote to-morrow afternoon or evening if the House is ready under the rule to vote on it at that time. There can be no agreement by unanimous consent.

Mr. MANN. There can be no agreement now. All the gentlemen can do is to move to adjourn. You can not tell now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned under the order until to-morrow, Saturday, January 31, 1914, at 11 o'clock a. m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of War, transmitting abstracts of proposals received during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1913, for materials and labor in connection with works under the Engineer Department of the Army (H. Doc. No. 674); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting findings of fact and conclusions of law and opinion in the French spoliation claims, relating to the brig *Fair Columbian*, in the case of William C. Hill, surviving executor of William T. Corcoran, against The United States, and other cases (H. Doc. No. 675); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting findings of fact and conclusions of law and opinion in the French spoliation claims, relating to the sloop *Friendship*, in the case of Edward D. Lawrence and Isaac H. Lawrence, administrators of the estate of Benjamin Wyatt, against The United States, and in other cases (H. Doc. No. 676); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the Secretary of War, submitting an item of legislation designed to regulate the expenditure of the annual appropriation for the Organized Militia (H. Doc. No. 677); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Attorney General submitting an estimate of deficiency appropriation for enforcement of the antitrust laws for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1913 (H. Doc. No. 678); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. DENT, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 2728) for the relief of George P. Heard, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 203), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 8358) granting a pension to James Duffy; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 10632) granting an increase of pension to William M. Hairston; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 5991) to authorize the payment of \$2,000 to the widow of the late Tranquilino Luna, in full for his contest expenses in the contested-election case of Manzanares against Luna; Committee on Appropriations discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 12657) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate condemned cannon and cannon balls; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REILLY of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 12658) to authorize a survey of Quinnipiac River above Ferry Street Bridge, New Haven, Conn.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. STAFFORD: A bill (H. R. 12659) to regulate the employment and the activities of congressional legislative counsel and agents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAPES: A bill (H. R. 12660) to amend chapter 3608 of volume 34 of the United States Statutes at Large; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEITRICK: A bill (H. R. 12661) to provide for the survey of the Mystic River, Mass.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 12662) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to pay a cash reward for suggestions submitted by civilian employees of the several navy yards and naval stations of the Navy Department for improvement or economy in manufacturing processes or plant; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SLEMP: A bill (H. R. 12663) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Tazewell, in the State of Virginia; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 12664) to prevent fraud and unfair competition in the sale of patented and trade marked articles; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. KEATING: A bill (H. R. 12665) to increase the limit of cost of public building at La Junta, Colo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 12666) to establish a standard box for apples, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOON: A bill (H. R. 12667) to amend the postal and civil-service laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 12668) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Pawhuska, State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H. R. 12669) for purchasing a site for the erection of a public building at Adams, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 12670) to appropriate \$2,000 to experiment with grasses on the National Nebraska Forest Reserve at Halsey; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PADGETT: A bill (H. R. 12671) to increase the efficiency of the United States Navy by the appointment of six vice admirals; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HARDWICK: A bill (H. R. 12672) to authorize the purchase or acquisition of an aviation field at Augusta, Ga., for aviation and other military purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLAYTON: A bill (H. R. 12673) granting to the civilian employees of the United States the right to receive from it compensation for injuries sustained in the course of their employment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 12674) to provide for the allowance of drawback of tax on articles shipped to the island of Porto Rico or to the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PETERS of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 12675) authorizing the Treasury Department to test upon ships a device for hoisting and lowering lifeboats at sea; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 12736) to increase the limit of cost of a site for the Federal building at Pikeville, Ky.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 12738) to incorporate the Mississippi Valley Historical Association; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. TAYLOR of New York: A bill (H. R. 12739) providing for the improvement of the harbor at Ossining (Hudson River), N. Y.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. CANTRILL: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 205) to enable the Secretary of the Interior to legally fix and determine the ownership of and title to the fire-alarm system and appliances, apparatus, and connections heretofore placed and installed in the Government buildings of the Government Hospital for the Insane, and to determine such other questions as are provided for in the following resolution; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DALE: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 206) to convey the thanks of Congress to Capt. William Trow Aspinall, and through him to First Officer R. H. Buck, Second Officer Sidney,

Williams, and Third Officer Frederick Roberts, of the steamship *Gregory*, of the Booth Line, for prompt and heroic service rendered by them in rescuing seven members of the crew from the wreck of the steamship *Oklahoma* off the Scotland Lightship; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. POST: Resolution (H. Res. 396) to declare John M. C. Smith duly elected a Representative from the third congressional district of Michigan; to the House Calendar.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BORLAND: A bill (H. R. 12676) granting an increase of pension to Albert H. Lanphear; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 12677) for the relief of William W. Danenhower; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 12678) for the relief of Edgar B. Havener, Laura T. Havener, Sallie L. Darns, Olivia E. Adrian, Alice D. Myers, and Ida J. Muse, heirs of Thomas A. Havener; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: A bill (H. R. 12679) to give the Court of Claims jurisdiction to hear and adjudge the claims of the estate of John Frazer, deceased, and of the estate of Zephaniah Kingsley, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CLAYPOOL: A bill (H. R. 12680) granting an increase of pension to James Hickman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DICKINSON: A bill (H. R. 12681) for the relief of W. W. Wall; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12682) for the relief of Abraham Smith; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12683) granting an increase of pension to James B. H. McDaniel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DONOHUE: A bill (H. R. 12684) granting a pension to Lena Stroup; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FAIRCHILD: A bill (H. R. 12685) granting a pension to Elizabeth Beach; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FALCONER: A bill (H. R. 12686) providing for the relief of settlers on unsurveyed railroad lands; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 12687) for the relief of the estate of Johnson Miller, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FOSTER: A bill (H. R. 12688) granting an increase of pension to Z. D. French; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FAIRCHILD: A bill (H. R. 12689) granting an increase of pension to Lovina M. Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 12690) granting a pension to James Shepherd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GERRY: A bill (H. R. 12691) granting a pension to Abner L. Phillips; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 12692) for the relief of William C. Barnes; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12693) for the relief of F. M. Wise; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12694) for the relief of the estate of Hugh Heard, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GREGG: A bill (H. R. 12695) for the relief of the legal representatives of William W. Browning, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12696) for the relief of the legal representatives of John W. Lockhart, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HAMLIN: A bill (H. R. 12697) granting an increase of pension to William D. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 12698) granting an increase of pension to John Sturtz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12699) granting a pension to John Stalter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12700) granting a pension to Minerva A. Kelly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOLLAND: A bill (H. R. 12701) for the relief of the legal representatives of Seth Foster, John Foster, John Tunis, D. Gordon, William J. Hardy, and Thomas A. Hardy; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington (by request): A bill (H. R. 12702) to place the name of Lieut. E. Floyd Barnum upon the unlimited retired list of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KEATING: A bill (H. R. 12703) granting a pension to Irving Reed; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KEY of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 12704) granting an increase of pension to Rachel Delvert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12705) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Schenffer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 12706) granting an increase of pension to Allen Farler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 12707) granting an increase of pension to Irving W. Tyson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 12708) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Jewitt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12709) granting an increase of pension to Ichabod S. Prosser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAPES: A bill (H. R. 12710) granting a pension to Carrie I. Hubbell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Mr. Mr. O'BRIEN: A bill (H. R. 12711) granting a pension to Annie Toomey; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 12712) granting an increase of pension to Olive S. Fiske; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REED: A bill (H. R. 12713) granting an increase of pension to Lewis L. Bean; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REILLY of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 12714) granting an increase of pension to Charles Shanley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: A bill (H. R. 12715) for the relief of the legal representatives of the estate of James M. Jones; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 12716) for the relief of James Woods; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12717) granting a pension to Rufus H. Hopkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUBEY: A bill (H. R. 12718) granting an increase of pension to George Burgess; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12719) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Shreeve; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCULLY: A bill (H. R. 12720) granting a pension to John Zogg; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12721) granting an increase of pension to William Ottmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SELLS: A bill (H. R. 12722) granting a pension to Melvina A. Argenbright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12723) granting a pension to Addie Holt; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 12724) granting a pension to Elizabeth M. Pierson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12725) granting a pension to David Guy Stout; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12726) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the Sanford & Brooks Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 12727) granting a pension to Nancy M. S. Piercy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12728) granting a pension to Miranda C. Whitaker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12729) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of T. J. Caskey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROUSE: A bill (H. R. 12730) for the relief of the estate of Lewis Stephens, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SLOAN: A bill (H. R. 12731) granting an increase of pension to Frank Carter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12732) granting an increase of pension to Nathan Dunlap; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12733) granting an increase of pension to Gilman D. Willey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DIXON: A bill (H. R. 12734) granting a pension to Clara A. Harlow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ALLEN: A bill (H. R. 12735) granting an increase of pension to Bridget Murray; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 12737) granting an increase of pension to Amos E. Evans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petitions of citizens of Boston, Mass.; New York City; Detroit, Mich.; and Waukegan, Ill., and the Workman's Circle Branch, No. 122, protesting against the literacy test in the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also (by request), petition of Branch No. 191 of the Workmen's Circle, protesting against the passage of the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also (by request), petition of the city clerk of Minneapolis, Minn., favoring an investigation of the strike conditions in Michigan; to the Committee on Rules.

Also (by request), petitions of citizens and organizations of the States of New York, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, Virginia, Indiana, New Jersey, Illinois, Maryland, Michigan, Connecticut, and Rhode Island, protesting against the literacy test in the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also (by request), memorial of the American Continental League, of Jersey City, N. J., favoring the "One hundred Years of Peace Celebration"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ALLEN: Petitions of German-American Alliance of Ohio and Kentucky; Business Men's Club of Cincinnati, Ohio; and citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, against immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Ohio Valley Druggists' Association, respecting the preserving of uniform retail prices on standard goods; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of Branch No. 26, National Association of Civil Service Employees, favoring bill for retirement of superannuated employees; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. ANSBERRY: Petition of citizens of Cincinnati, protesting against the passage of House bill 6060, restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: Petition of the Banner Iron Works, of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of the Bartlett-Bacon anti-injunction bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of J. M. Wagehan and others, of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against eliminating the publication, *The Menace*, from the mails; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of the Workmen's Circle of New York City, protesting against the passage of the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Beer Bottlers' Local No. 187, of St. Louis, Mo., favoring an investigation of the strike in Michigan; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BELL of California: Petition of citizens of the ninth congressional district of California, favoring a law for the payment of pensions monthly; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CALDER: Petition of the Cloak and Skirt Makers' Unions, protesting against the passage of House bill 6060, restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of the United States, favoring the passage of House bill 6060, restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of the Commodore Barry Branch, No. 311, Continental League of America, protesting against the "One hundred years of peace celebration"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CARR: Petitions of the committee of Stone Bridge Council, No. 573, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Somerfield, and 43 citizens of Confluence and 53 citizens of High House, Pa., favoring the passage of House bill 6060, restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the J. S. Ogilvie Publishing Co., of New York, protesting against the passage of House bill 5308, relative to mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of the Journeymen Tailors' Union of America, Local No. 86, of Milwaukee, protesting against the passage of the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of citizens adopted at a meeting in Cincinnati, Ohio, against the passage of the immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: Petition of the Board of Trade of Ocala, Fla., favoring improvement of Oklawaha River in Florida; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of C. H. Spittel and others of the State of Florida, favoring construction of two battleships; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. COOPER: Memorial of International Association of Machinists, Local No. 7, of Milwaukee; International Brotherhood of Teamsters of Kenosha; Carpenters and Joiners' Local No. 1314, of Oconomowoc; Brewers' Union No. 277, of Sheboygan; Danish Branch of Socialist Party of Kenosha, Wis., all favoring an investigation of the strike in Michigan; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DYER: Petitions of M. D. Degge, of St. Louis, Mo., and the Merchants' Association of New York City, protesting against the passage of the Bartlett-Bacon anti-injunction bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EAGAN: Petition of the Italian Journal, of New York City, protesting against the passage of House bill 6060 restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Branch No. 3, Hoboken Socialist Party, of Hoboken, N. J., favoring an investigation of the strike in Michigan; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FARR: Petitions of Workmen's Circle, of New York City, and members of St. Mary's Roman Catholic Church, Dickson, Pa., against immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Philadelphia Branch of National League of Commission Merchants, against House bill 9266; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GALLAGHER: Petition of James White Paper Co., of Chicago, Ill., favoring Humphreys bill; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of Rubel-Lillienfeld Co., of Chicago, Ill., against House joint resolution 168; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GERRY: Petition of Wolf Lone Literary Association, of Riverpoint, R. I., protesting against the passage of bill for celebrating "One hundred years of peace"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Cigar Makers' Union No. 94, of Pawtucket, R. I., protesting against the passage of House joint resolution 168, for Federal prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of Independent Order B'rith Abraham; Italian C. P. Work Club; Societa Italiana M. S. Roma; Benevolenza Society; Court Savoy, No. 45, E. of A.; Federal Labor Union, No. 12760; M. S. I. Del Bosco Society; Isola O'Sschia Society; Hebrew Criterion Society; Ninth Ward Italo-American Democratic Club; Guiseppe Garibaldi Society; and San Paolo Society, all of Providence, R. I., protesting against immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas: Letters of Dan Ragen, of Arkansas, relative to railway mail clerks; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Petition of Relief Council, No. 47, Order of United American Mechanics, of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring the passage of House bill 6060, restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GRIEST: Memorial of the State Administrators of Vocational Education, favoring the passage of Senate joint resolution 5, relative to national commission on vocational education; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. HAYES: Petitions of Carpenters' Union No. 1913, of Daly City, and Retail Clerks' Local Union No. 428, of San Jose, Cal., favoring the passage of the seamen's bill (S. 136); to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of the Watsonville (Cal.) Apple Annual Association, protesting against the passage of House bill 9987, cold-storage bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: Petitions of citizens of the first congressional district of the State of Washington, protesting against the passage of the Lindquist pure fabric and leather bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. IGOE: Petition of Socialist Party of St. Louis, of St. Louis, Mo., against immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Petitions of organizations and societies of Providence, R. I., protesting against the passage of House bill 6060, restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: Petitions of members of Williamsport Council, No. 104, Daughters of Liberty, of Williamsport, Pa., favoring the passage of the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, papers to accompany a bill (H. R. 11425) for the relief of Catherine Webb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition of the Manufacturers' Association of Bridgeport, Conn., protesting against the passage of the Bacon-Bartlett anti-injunction bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCKENZIE: Petition of citizens of Erie, Ill., favoring the Hobson prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MERRITT: Petitions of officers and members of the Waddington and Brasher Falls Auxiliary of St. Lawrence Presbyterial Society of Home and Foreign Missions, favoring the passage of the antipolygamy amendment to the National Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of business men of Gouverneur and Canton, N. Y., favoring the passage of House bill 5308, relative to mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOORE: Memorial of Belt Hamedrosh Magodel Nussli Asknaz, of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against the passage of House bill 6060, restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. J. I. NOLAN: Petitions of the San Francisco Labor Council, of San Francisco, Cal., and 32 other labor organizations in the city of San Francisco in behalf of the passage of the seamen's bill (S. 136); to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Petition of Joe Levey, of Providence, R. I., and the 13 lodges and 2,300 members of the Hebrew race of the State of Rhode Island, protesting against the passage of the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petitions of organizations of the State of Rhode Island, protesting against the passage of the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Cigar Makers' Union, No. 94, of Pawtucket, R. I., protesting against the passage of House joint resolution 168, for Federal prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PLUMLEY: Petition of citizens of Jamaica and vicinity, State of Vermont, protesting against the passage of the Sabbath-observance bill (H. R. 9674); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. REILLY of Connecticut: Petition of the Hebrews of Meriden, Conn., protesting against the passage of House bill 6060, restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of American National Retail Jewelers' Association, favoring the passage of bill relative to fraud in gold-filled watchcases; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petitions of Yale Lodge, No. 268, and citizens of New Haven, Conn., protesting against the passage of House bill 6060, restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petition of the Workmen's Sick and Death Benefit Fund of the United States, Branch No. 38, of Sayreville, N. J., protesting against the passage of House joint resolution 168, for Federal prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of the Italian Journal, of New York City, and Long Branch (N. J.) Lodge, No. 526, Independent Order of B'rith Abraham, protesting against the passage of House bill 6060, restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SELDOMRIDGE: Petitions of John O. Ferris, the Brown Drug Co., and H. Levin & Son, of Colorado, protesting against the passage of House joint resolution 168, for Federal prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Order of Railway Conductors, favoring the passage of House bill 6060, restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Colorado, protesting against the passage of the Sabbath-observance bill (H. R. 9674); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. J. M. C. SMITH: Petition of the Italian Journal, of New York City, against immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Charles F. Glen, of Muskegon, Mich., against House joint resolution 168; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEN EYCK: Statement of Eugene Gallup, carrier on rural route No. 3, Altamont, Albany County, N. Y., showing actual cost of necessary equipment and maintenance of same to properly serve his route during the year 1913; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, statement of Walter Kernbolt, carrier on rural route No. 1, Altamont, Albany County, N. Y., showing actual cost of

necessary equipment and maintenance of same to properly serve his route during the year 1913; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, statement of George H. Cunningham, carrier on rural route No. 1, Ravena, Albany County, N. Y., showing actual cost of necessary equipment and maintenance of same to properly serve his route during the year 1913; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. THACHER: Memorial of New Bedford (Mass.) Lodge, No. 304, Independent Order B'rith Abraham, against the immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Memorial of Frederick Key Camp, No. 1, Department of North Dakota, United Spanish War Veterans, favoring the passage of the Crago bill, granting pensions to widows and minor children of Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of North Dakota, protesting against the elimination of a publication called The Menace from the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of members of Elendale (N. Dak.) Local, No. 26, Socialist Party, favoring an investigation of the strike in Michigan; to the Committee on Rules.

## SENATE.

SATURDAY, January 31, 1914.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP OF ELECTRICAL MEANS OF COMMUNICATION (S. DOC. NO. 399).

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Postmaster General transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 12th instant, a report entitled "Government ownership of electrical means of communication," prepared by direction of the Postmaster General by a departmental committee consisting of the First Assistant Postmaster General, the chief clerk of the department, and the superintendent of the division of salaries and allowances of the Bureau of the First Assistant. The communication will be printed and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. NORRIS. I ask unanimous consent that the report of the Postmaster General, together with the information furnished, be printed as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is perfectly apparent that the request of the Senator can not be complied with. On account of the size of the document, it will have to go to the Committee on Printing before it can be printed.

Mr. NORRIS. Then, Mr. President, I ask that it be referred to the Committee on Printing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is of opinion that it should go first to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, and it can subsequently be referred to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. NORRIS. I think, under the Chair's statement, it will have to go at least to the Committee on Printing before it can be printed; and sending it to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads only delays it. Sending it to the Committee on Printing, of course, does not necessarily mean that the document will be printed. That committee will investigate it; and it seems to me that really the only thing to investigate will be whether or not it ought to be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska desire to appeal from the ruling of the Chair that the document be referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads?

Mr. NORRIS. No; I do not, but I make the request of the Chair that he refer it to the Committee on Printing, instead of to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair can not refer it to two committees. The Chair has referred it to the appropriate committee, the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

WASHINGTON & OLD DOMINION RAILWAY (S. DOC. NO. 398).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the Washington & Old Dominion Railway for the year ended December 31, 1913, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I send to the desk a telegram in the nature of resolutions adopted at a special meeting of delegates representing 57 organizations of various nationalities in the city of Hartford, Conn., and ask that the same may